2002 Status of the Armed Forces Survey — Workplace and Gender Relations

Report on Scales and Measures

2002 STATUS OF THE ARMED FORCES SURVEY-WORKPLACE AND GENDER RELATIONS: REPORT ON SCALES AND MEASURES

Alayne J. Ormerod, Angela K. Lawson, Carra S. Sims, Maria C. Lytell, Patrick L. Wadlington, Daniel W. Yaeger, Caroline Vaile Wright, Maggie E. Reed, Wayne C. Lee, Fritz Drasgow, Louise F. Fitzgerald, and Cari A. Cohorn

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

2002 STATUS OF THE ARMED FORCES SURVEY-
WORKPLACE AND GENDER RELATIONS:
REPORT ON SCALES AND MEASURES

Executive Summary

In 2002, the Department of Defense (DoD) and Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) conducted the third DoD-wide survey on sexual harassment and other unprofessional, gender-related experiences of active duty military personnel. This report describes advances from previous surveys and presents results on scale development as obtained from 19,960 respondents to the survey.

The 16-page survey booklet included an in-depth series of questions concerning background and workplace demographics, mentoring, readiness, health and well-being, gender-related experiences in the military, as well as personnel and policy practices. Scales were composed of multiple items and results were reported in terms of reliability coefficients (i.e., Cronbach's coefficient alpha), means, standard deviations, standard errors, and frequency counts. Scales, rather than single items, were utilized because measures that rely on multiple items to tap a construct of interest are more reliable than those relying on single items. Statistics are reported for men and women combined and separately by gender.

Particular attention was paid to assessing unprofessional, gender-related behavior and sexual harassment. Historically, different methods of calculating sexual harassment rates have been employed in DoD-wide and Service-wide surveys of sexual harassment. This resulted in rates that were not comparable across surveys. In November 1998, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Equal Opportunity (DASD[EO]) convened a meeting of Service and Reserve Component representatives to review existing measures and make recommendations for a standardized method for use in both DoD- and Service-wide surveys. The resulting measure is based on two survey questions which represent the "DoD Sexual Harassment Core Measure" (Survey Method for Counting Incidents of Sexual Harassment, 2002). The measure consisted of thirteen items, twelve items that measured unprofessional, gender-related behaviors, and one item that asked Service members whether they considered any of the core gender-related behaviors to have been sexual harassment. Together, these thirteen items are used to calculate the incident rate for the DoD Sexual Harassment Core Measure.

Table of Contents

Appendixes

List of Tables

Table of Contents (Continued)

2002 STATUS OF THE ARMED FORCES SURVEY-WORKPLACE AND GENDER RELATIONS: REPORT ON SCALES AND MEASURES

Introduction

The *2002 Status of the Armed Forces Survey–Workplace and Gender Relations* (*2002 WGR*) is the third Department of Defense (DoD)–wide survey of active-duty members that focuses on sexual harassment and gender issues. The first survey was fielded in 1988 and the second in 1995.[1] The 1995 survey (*1995 Form B*), was designed to both estimate the level of sexual harassment in the Services and provide new information on a variety of potential antecedents and consequences of harassment (Bastian, Lancaster, & Reyst, 1996). The new measures were intended to increase understanding of sexual harassment and of policies and programs that prevent it from occurring, as well as gather information on a variety of workplace issues.

2002 WGR was designed to take advantage of the developments in sexual harassment measurement technology that have occurred since 1995 and to implement a standardized method for measuring and counting sexual harassment incidents. In keeping with advances on *1995 Form B*, *2002 WGR* uses multiple item measures to assess antecedent and outcome constructs related to unprofessional, gender-related behaviors and workplace relations. Psychometric validation of the measures is provided in this report. Outcome measures are assessed prior to asking about unprofessional, gender-related behaviors and workplace relations (Drasgow, Fitzgerald, Magley, Waldo, & Zickar, 1999; Fitzgerald, Drasgow, & Magley, 1999). *2002 WGR* further improved the measurement of unprofessional, gender-related behaviors and workplace relations and their associated constructs by revising existing scales and adding new ones, such as measures of enlistment support, leadership, workplace respect, mentoring, discrimination, and personnel policy and practices to assess constructs not previously measured. This report describes results of psychometric analyses of the scales and measures utilized in the *2002 WGR*. The items included in each scale are listed, along with the scale's means, standard deviations, standard errors, and reliabilities. Results are given for both men and women (see Magley, Waldo, Drasgow, & Fitzgerald, 1999).

---

[1] See Lancaster (1999) for a historical perspective of DoD-wide research about unprofessional, gender-related behavior.

Methodology

Sample Design and Survey Administration

The population of inferential interest for *2002 WGR* consisted of all active duty members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Coast Guard, up to and including paygrade O-6, with at least 6 months of service at the time the first questionnaire was mailed.

The initial sample for the *2002 WGR* consisted of a non-proportional stratified, single-stage random sample of 60,415 active-duty military personnel. Of this sample, 56,521 were determined to be eligible members of the population of interest. The stratification categories included Service, gender, paygrade group, and racial/ethnic group membership. Details of the sample design and expected precision levels are reported by Elig (2003). Sample members had the option of taking the survey either on-line or by a paper-and-pencil survey. One-third of respondents elected to take the survey on-line with the majority returning the paper-and-pencil version. The survey administration is documented in Willis, Mohamed, and Lipari (2002). Completed surveys were received from 19,960 (men, $n = 10,235$, women, $n = 9,725$) eligible members. The eligibility-adjusted response rate was 36%. Completed surveys were scanned and entered into a database and case weights were determined based on sampling probabilities and response rates for the various strata (Flores Cervantes, Valliant, Harding, & Bell, 2003).

Survey Instrument

2002 WGR was designed to provide users with timely, policy relevant information. The survey booklet was designed and formatted to facilitate ease and reliability of responding, and to minimize possible response bias and demand effects. It was constructed around a core of questions grouped into six general sections. The 16-page survey booklet appears in Appendix B.

- **Background**-gender, race/ethnic status, education, duty status, Service, paygrade, and length of time in service. The scales reported in this section include those that describe military and workplace attitudes and actions.

- **Workplace Information**-permanent duty station, supervisors, leadership, and coworkers.

- **Mentoring**-use of mentors and their background and helpfulness.

- **Readiness, Health, and Well-Being**-individual preparedness and physical and emotional health.

- **Gender-Related Experiences in Military**-extent to which gender experiences were reported, and, if reported, members' satisfaction with the complaint process and outcome.

- **Personnel Policy and Practices**-amount of training on sexual harassment, members' assessment of the effectiveness of training received, and members' views on current policies designed to prevent or reduce sexual harassment.

Survey content was developed based on input from representatives from policy offices within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, Service representatives, and multiple focus groups (Willis, Mohamed, & Lipari, 2002).

Results

Descriptions of the major scales are presented here, in the order that they appear in the questionnaire, including the items contained within each scale, internal consistency reliability estimates (Cronbach's coefficient α), means, standard deviations, standard errors, and a frequency count for selected scales. Results of multivariate analyses are reported for longer or multidimensional scales. Scales utilized in previous DoD-wide gender issue surveys, and scales derived from published measures are identified in the scale descriptions.

Each scale is composed of multiple items to measure the theoretical construct of interest. Wherever possible, existing scales were designed to be comparable to *1995 Form B*. Scales were drawn from psychological literature and adapted for use in a military setting, or were drawn from previous military surveys (e.g., the *1999 Survey of Active Duty Personnel Form A;* Wright, Williams, & Willis, 2000; Helba et al., 2001).[2] Where existing measures were not available, scales were constructed to tap the construct of interest and tested in a pilot sample of military personnel. Researchers from the *DMDC* and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) conducted a pilot test on 737 military members from two different military installations (Ormerod, Lee, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 2001). The purpose was to: pretest the shortened and standardized measure of sexual harassment and other unprofessional, gender-related behaviors; examine response rates of both long and short versions of the survey; test an algorithm for counting incidences; develop an improved measure of sexist behavior; and revise and assess the correlates of sexual harassment and other unprofessional, gender-related behaviors.[3]

Analyses were conducted on surveys determined to be usable based on whether respondents completed at least 50% of all items that they were eligible to answer and answered at least one item on the Unprofessional, Gender-Related Behaviors scale (Item 55). Table 1 provides information about whether the scales were relatively homogenous and internally consistent. The reliability estimates (i.e., Cronbach's coefficient α) are listed for each scale for the total sample and by gender, and were calculated using SPSS 11.0.1 software.

Table 2 provides the means, standard deviations, and standard errors for each scale by gender. The statistics were computed using weighted data, unless otherwise noted. The means reported in Table 2 were obtained by summing the item scores for each scale described below. Therefore, the means are based on those individuals who had completed all data points; those who had not were removed via list wise deletion.

---

[2] See Willis, Mohamed, and Lipari (2002) for a crosswalk between *2002 WGR* and other military surveys.
[3] See Ormerod, Lee, Fitzgerald, and Drasgow (2000) for a description of the pilot test.

Table 1.
Reliability Estimates for Scales Constructed from 2002 WGR

Scale	Crohbach α for Total Sample	Cronbach α for Women	Cronbach α for Men
Compensation Satisfaction (16A-F)	.83	.83	.83
Medical Care Satisfaction (16G-K)	.87	.88	.86
Child care Satisfaction (16L-N)	.83	.81	.85
Military Life Satisfaction (16P-V)	.81	.82	.81
Commitment (17A-C)	.84	.85	.83
Passive Exit Actions (18A-F)	.77	.77	.77
Active Exit Actions (18G-J)	.71	.68	.72
Enlistment Support (22A-D)	.80	.82	.79
Army Azimuth Scale (37A-L)	.96	.97	.96
Army Azimuth Scale (37A,C,E,J,K)	.91	.91	.91
Army Azimuth Scale (37B,D,F,G,H,I,L)	.95	.95	.95
Careerism (38B,D,E,F and 36.B)	.82	.83	.81
Supervisor Satisfaction (38A-I)	.89	.90	.88
Coworker Satisfaction (39A-F)	.91	.92	.91
Work Satisfaction (39G-L)	.91	.91	.91
Workplace Hostility (40A-J)	.93	.93	.93
Mentoring–Career Development–2 factor (44A-D,J,K, N-P)	.91	.91	.91
Mentoring–Social–2 factor (44E-I,L,M)	.92	.92	.92
Mentoring–Career Development–3 factor (44A-D)	.88	.88	.88
Mentoring–Sponsorship–3 factor (44O,P)	.84	.84	.84
Mentoring–Psychosocial–3 factor (44E,G-I, L,M)	.91	.91	.91
General Health (50A-D)	.75	.77	.73
Role Limitations due to Physical Health (51A-D)	.89	.89	.89
Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (52A-C)	.90	.90	.90
Psychological Distress (53A-E)	.83	.84	.81
Discrimination–Workplace (54A-LM)	.76	.75	.76
Evaluation Discrimination (54A-D)	.49	.47	.50
Assignment Discrimination (54E,F,G,LM)	.61	.62	.61
Career Discrimination (54H-K)	.62	.62	.62
Discrimination–Gender (54A-LM)	.81	.82	.76
Evaluation Discrimination (54A-D)	.65	.65	.60
Assignment Discrimination (54E,F,G,LM)	.65	.66	.57
Career Discrimination (54H-K)	.71	.70	.70
Sexist Behavior (55B,D,G,I)	.87	.87	.72
Crude/Offensive Behavior (55A,C,E,F)	.87	.88	.81
Unwanted Sexual Attention (55H,J,M,N)	.85	.84	.87
Sexual Coercion (55K,L,O,P)	.86	.85	.90
Sexual Assault (55Q,R)	.78	.70	.90

Table 1. (Continued)

Scale	Crohbach α for Total Sample	Cronbach α for Women	Cronbach α for Men
Behaviors Indicative of Sexual Harassment[4] (55A,C,E,F,H,J,K,L,M,N,O,P)	.92	.92	.88
One Situation (57A-S)	.76	.75	.68
Sexist Behavior (57B,D,G,I)	.73	.71	.61
Crude/Offensive Behavior (57A,C,E,F)	.63	.67	.50
Unwanted Sexual Attention (57H,J,M,N)	.78	.78	.72
Sexual Coercion (57K,L,O,P)	.79	.79	.80
Sexual Assault (57Q,R)	.40	.40	.41
Subjective Distress I (58A,B,C,D,E)	.86	.84	.87
Subjective Distress II (58D,F)	.87	.87	.85
Internal Coping (65B,E,L,N,O,Q)	.70	.71	.70
External Coping–Social Support (65F,G,H,I,P)	.74	.72	.78
External Coping–Confrontation (65C,K,M)	.86	.86	.82
External Coping–Behavioral Avoidance (65A,D,J)	.90	.90	.89
Satisfaction with Reporting (69A-E)	.90	.89	.94
Satisfaction with Reporting and Outcome (69A-E, 72)	.91	.90	.93
Retaliation (75A-L)	.90	.89	.91
Retaliation–Personal (75A,B,C)	.78	.79	.76
Retaliation–Professional (75D-K)	.87	.87	.90
Sexual Harassment Climate (76E-G, 77.E-G, 78.E-G)	.91	.91	.90
Leadership Efforts to Stop Sexual Harassment (79A,B,C)	.82	.80	.84
Training and Education (82A-G)	.94	.93	.95
Training Required (83D,E,L,M)	.95	.95	.95
Sexual Harassment Training Resources (83A,B,C,F,H,I,J,K,N)	.93	.93	.93

Note. Item numbers are shown in parentheses following the scale name.

---

[4] Scores on the Behaviors Indicative of Sexual Harassment scale are not equivalent to the DoD metric for assessing or reporting sexual harassment because it does not include Item 56.

Table 2.
Scale Range, Means, Standard Deviations, and Standard Errors

Scale	Range	WOMEN			MEN		
		Mean	SDa	Seb	Mean	Sda	Seb
Compensation Satisfaction (16A-F)	1–5	3.03	.86	.01	2.88	.86	.01
Medical Care Satisfaction (16G-K)	1–5	3.56	.99	.01	3.42	.97	.01
Child care Satisfaction (16L-N)	1–5	2.85	1.03	.02	2.96	.93	.02
Military Life Satisfaction (16P-V)	1–5	3.33	.82	.01	3.34	.83	.01
Commitment (17A-C)	1–5	3.91	.83	.01	4.05	.79	.01
Enlistment Support (22A-D)	1–5	3.44	.78	.03	3.45	.72	.02
Army Azimuth Scale (37A-L)	1–5	3.53	1.02	.01	3.69	.95	.01
Army Azimuth Scale (37A,C,E,J,K)	1–5	3.62	.98	.01	3.77	.93	.01
Army Azimuth Scale (37B,D,F,G,H,I,L)	1–5	3.46	1.09	.01	3.63	1.00	.01
Careerism (38B,D,E,F and 36.B)	1–5	2.83	.98	.01	2.73	.93	.01
Supervisor Satisfaction (38.A-I)	1–5	3.23	.89	.01	3.37	.84	.01
Coworker Satisfaction (39A-F)	1–5	3.48	.87	.01	3.62	.78	.01
Work Satisfaction (39G-L)	1–5	3.46	1.01	.01	3.56	.97	.01
Workplace Hostility (40A-J)	1–5	2.01	.94	.01	1.99	.95	.01
Mentoring–Career Development (44A-D,J,K,N-P)	1–5	3.97	.80	.01	3.86	.78	.01
Mentoring–Social (44E-I,L,M)	1–5	4.23	.78	.01	4.06	.78	.01
General Health (50A-D)	1–4	3.31	.58	.01	3.40	.53	.01
Role Limitations due to Physical Health (51A-D)	1–4	1.33	.60	.01	1.27	.54	.01
Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems (52A-C)	1–4	1.34	.62	.01	1.27	.55	.01
Psychological Distress (53A-E)	1–4	1.86	.67	.01	1.79	.62	.01
Sexist Behavior (55B,D,G,I)	0–4	.54	.81	.01	.11	.35	.00
Crude/Offensive Behavior (55A,C,E,F)	0–4	.45	.77	.01	.18	.48	.01

Table 2. (Continued)

Scale	Range	WOMEN			MEN		
		Mean	SDa	Seb	Mean	Sda	Seb
Unwanted Sexual Attention (55H,J,M,N)	0–4	.25	.56	.01	.04	.25	.00
Sexual Coercion (55K,L,O,P)	0–4	.07	.33	.00	.02	.17	.00
Sexual Assault (55Q,R)	0–4	.03	.19	.00	.01	.15	.00
Behaviors Indicative of Sexual Harassment (55A,C,E,F,H,J,K,L, M, N,O,P)	0–4	.26	.49	.01	.08	.25	.00
Subjective Distress I (58A,B,C,E)	0–4	1.89	1.11	.02	1.23	1.07	.03
Subjective Distress II (58D,F)	0–4	.60	1.04	.02	.27	.73	.02
Internal Coping (65B,E,L,N,O,Q)	0–4	1.23	.81	.01	1.12	.81	.02
External Coping–Social Support (65F,G,H,I,P)	0–4	1.05	.93	.02	.65	.83	.02
External Coping–Confrontation (65C,K,M)	0–4	1.81	1.37	.02	1.25	1.23	.04
External Coping–Behavioral Avoidance (65A,D,J)	0–4	1.96	1.41	.02	1.24	1.31	.04
Satisfaction with Reporting (69A-E)	1–5	2.96	.99	.03	3.04	1.07	.07
Satisfaction with Reporting and Outcome (69A-E, 72)	1–5	2.96	.98	.03	3.06	1.05	.07
Retaliation (75A-L)	1–3	1.20	.37	.01	1.17	.34	.01
Retaliation–Personal (75A,B,C)	1–3	1.35	.57	.01	1.27	.49	.01
Retaliation–Professional (75D-K)	1–3	1.14	.34	.01	1.14	.33	.01
Sexual Harassment Climate (76E-G, 77E-G, 78E-G)	1–5	2.17	.70	.01	2.04	.67	.01
Leadership Efforts to Stop Sexual Harassment (79A,B,C)	1–3	2.60	.53	.01	2.72	.47	.01
Training and Education (82A-G)	1–5	4.11	.64	.01	4.15	.65	.01
Training Required (83D,E,L,M)	0–4	2.46	1.16	.02	2.58	1.09	.01
Sexual Harassment Training Resources (83A,B,C,F,H,I,J,K,N)	0–4	2.41	.94	.01	2.57	.91	.01

Note. For Item 55 the means, standard deviations, and standard errors were calculated following data imputation described in the results.
[a]Standard deviations were computed by SAS PROCMEANS. The standard deviations are weighted and irrespective of strata with the sum of the weights as the divisor.
[b]Standard error of the mean was computed by SAS PROCSURVEYMEANS adjusting for nonrandom sampling. [c]Scores on the Behaviors Indicative of Sexual Harassment scale are not equivalent to the Department of Defense metric for assessing or reporting Sexual Harassment because it does not include Item 56.

In addition, a second method was also used to calculate the means for Item 55. In this method, means were calculated following data imputation. Data were imputed using the following process: for each subscale, the respondent was required to have responded to at least one item on the subscale; if there were one or more responses; any missing data were imputed as zeros.

Following imputation, the items were summed to form a scale score. This process was used to maintain consistency with the frequency counts reported in Table 3 and with the frequency counts reported for the *1995 Form B* (Bastian, Lancaster, & Reyst, 1996). Thus the means, standard deviations, and standard errors for Item 55 were calculated using two different methods and are reported as such in Table 2. The means were calculated on the weighted data using PROC SURVEYMEANS in SAS V8.02. Standard errors of the means were computed by SAS PROC SURVEYMEANS adjusting for nonrandom sampling. The standard deviations were computed by SAS PROC SURVEYMEANS and are weighted irrespective of strata with the sum of the weights as the divisor.

Table 3 presents the frequency counts, expressed as percentages, for exit actions, discrimination, unprofessional, gender-related behavior, the DoD Sexual Harassment Core Measure, and the "One Situation." Percentages were calculated in SAS V8.02 using weighted data. Percentages for the discrimination subscales (Item 54) were calculated for those respondents who had complete data. Percentages for the unprofessional, gender-related behavior subscales (Item 55), with the exception of the DoD Sexual Harassment Core Measure, reflect those respondents who experienced one or more incident on the particular subscale being reported. Percentages for the DoD Sexual Harassment Core Measure were calculated using a counting algorithm described with Items 55 and 56 in a later section of this report.

Confirmatory factor analyses were conducted for longer scales to examine the number of factors or dimensions per scale. All confirmatory factor analyses were performed using PRELIS 2.14 and LISREL 8.14 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993).

When conducting confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), or structural equation modeling (SEM), fit statistics are used to evaluate whether a specified model adequately fits the data. There are numerous fit statistics to choose from and little agreement exists about which indices are best (Klem, 2000). Compounding the issue of which index to report, the literature routinely offers guidance about cut scores for interpreting fit statistics (e.g., Byrne, 1998, provides suggestions culled from the SEM literature), but provides little discussion about the strengths and weaknesses associated with particular fit statistics. This has led to the interpretation of fit statistics being somewhat subjective. Issues to consider when evaluating whether a fit statistic is appropriate to report include sample size and non-normality of the observed data. Real-world data are often non-normal and the data from *2002 WGR* are no exception. Various authors (e.g., Byrne, 1998, and Klem, 2000) recommend taking a holistic approach when evaluating SEM and CFA models, that is, examining fit statistics, but not neglecting other important features that indicate the acceptability of the model, such as the plausibility of parameter estimates, the size of standard errors, and theoretical criteria. Thus conclusions about the adequacy of a model are based on an accumulation of evidence rather than a particular cut score (Klem, 2000). Given the current lack of knowledge about using SEM and CFA with discrete item response data, it is necessary to consider all aspects of model fit rather than to rely solely on fit statistics and

particular cutoff scores alone. Often, a researcher must accumulate and rely on experience in SEM and CFA applications to determine a "good fit" statistic for a particular type of data. An expanded discussion about fit statistics can be found in Appendix A.

Two sets of items, 35A through 35P, and 36C through 36I, are copyrighted and will not be addressed in this report. For information on the psychometric properties of these items please contact the appropriate copyright holder.5 Other items were intended as single-item indicators (e.g., Items 45–49) and are not reported in this document. Items intended to function as checklists (e.g., Item 66) may be discussed, but will not include psychometric documentation.

Scales in the Background Section

Item 16, Compensation Satisfaction, Medical Care Satisfaction, Child care Satisfaction. In Items 16A-N, survey participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they were satisfied with three aspects of employee benefits (see Table 4). Response options ranged from 1 (*very dissatisfied*) to 5 (*very satisfied*). A sixth response option (*don't know or does not apply*) was available in 11 (16B-F, 16H, 16J-N) of the 14 items (16A-N). This response option was set to "missing" and was not utilized in the following psychometric analyses. A higher score denotes a higher degree of satisfaction with each type of employee benefit.

Items 16A-N were adopted or revised from the *1999 Survey of Active Duty Personnel Form A* (*1999 ADS*).[6] Item 16 consists of three subscales, each measuring a different aspect of satisfaction with pay or benefits. The subscales include Compensation Satisfaction, six items (16A-F) that assess satisfaction with various forms of military compensation (e.g., pay, retirement, housing allowance); Medical Care Satisfaction, five items (16G-K) that measure various aspects of health care for the service member and family members; and Child Care Satisfaction, four items (16L-N) that tap availability, cost, and quality of child care.[7]

Alpha coefficients for the total sample, women, and men on these three scales ranged from .81 to .88 (see Table 1). Given that Compensation, Medical Care, and Child Care Satisfaction are all forms of satisfaction with one's benefits, a three-factor model conforming to these three subscales was tested using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and labeled benefit satisfaction. The model fit the data reasonably well for men, women, and the full sample when considering all of the fit statistics (see Appendix A for a discussion of interpreting fit statistics). For example, RMSEA = .09, NNFI = .93, SRMR = .04, GFI = .92, AGFI = .89, and CFI = .94 in the total sample (see Appendix A).

---

[5] Items 35A through 35P are used by permission of the copyright holder, The Gallup Organization, 901 F Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20004. Items 36C through 36I are used by permission of the copyright holder, International Survey Research (ISR), 303 East Ohio Street, Suite 2100, Chicago, Illinois.

[6] Items were modified in one of two ways, including modifications to item content or splitting a more general item into several, more specific, items. An example of modification to item content is found in 16B: "Special and incentive pays including bonuses," was originally listed as "Special and incentive pay" in the *1999 ADS*. An example of splitting is evident in Item 16G "Availability of medical care for yourself," and Item 16I "Quality of medical care for yourself," which were originally listed as one item in the *1999 ADS*, "Medical care for you."

[7] In Table 4 (and in subsequent tables), numbers preceding the item refer to the question number in *2002 WGR*.

Table 3.

Percentages for Exit Actions, Discrimination, Unprofessional, Gender-Related Behaviors, DoD Sexual Harassment Core Measure, and the "One Situation"

Scale	Women	Men
Passive Exit Actions (18A-F)	93%	93%
Active Exit Actions (18G-J)	27%	30%
Discrimination–Workplace		
Evaluation Discrimination (54A-D)	50%	50%
Assignment Discrimination (54E,F,G,LM)	49%	46%
Career Discrimination (54H-K)	47%	41%
Discrimination–Gender		
Evaluation Discrimination (54A-D)	11%	5%
Assignment Discrimination (54E,F,G,LM)	8%	2%
Career Discrimination (54H-K)	9%	2%
Sexist Behavior (55B,D,G,I)	50%	17%
Crude/Offensive Behavior (55A,C,E,F)	45%	23%
Unwanted Sexual Attention (55H,J,M,N)	27%	5%
Sexual Coercion (55K,L,O,P)	8%	1%
Sexual Assault (55Q,R)	3%	1%
Other Behavior (55S)	2%	1%
DoD Sexual Harassment Core Measure [a] (55A,C,E,F,H,J,K,L,M,N,O,P, 56)	24%	3%
One Situation (57A-S)	44%	15%
Sexist Behavior (57B,D,G,I)	34%	6%
Crude/Offensive Behavior (57A,C,E,F)	30%	13%
Unwanted Sexual Attention (57H,J,M,N)	19%	3%
Sexual Coercion (57K,L,O,P)	5%	1%
Sexual Assault (57Q,R)	2%	0%
Other Behavior (57S)	5%	2%
Behaviors Indicative of Sexual Harassment [b] (57A,C,E,F,H,J,K,L,M,N,O,P)	34%	13%

[a] Survey measurement of sexual harassment is defined by the U.S. Department of Defense as the presence of behaviors indicative of sexual harassment (Crude/Offensive Behavior, Sexual Coercion, and Unwanted Sexual Attention) and the labeling of those behaviors as sexual harassment (Survey Method for Counting Incidents of Sexual Harassment, 2002). Sexist Behavior and Sexual Assault are not counted in the DoD survey measure of sexual harassment.

[b] Scores on the Behaviors Indicative of Sexual Harassment scale are not equivalent to the Department of Defense metric for assessing or reporting Sexual Harassment because it does not include Item 56.

A suggestion for improving this scale in the future is to include a skip-out before inquiring about benefits that do not apply to the full sample, such as child care and retirement pay. Providing such a skip-out would obviate the need for a "*does not apply*" response and avoid any problems that may have arisen due to confounding the "*don't know*" and "*does not apply*" response options.

Item 16, Military Life Satisfaction. In Items 16P-V, survey participants were asked about satisfaction with various aspects of military life (see Table 4). Response options ranged from 1 (*very dissatisfied*) to 5 (*very satisfied*). A higher score indicates a higher degree of satisfaction.

Military Life Satisfaction is composed of four items that were adopted or revised from the *1999 ADS* and three new items. Items 16P, 16R, 16S, and 16U are similar to items originally utilized in the *1999 ADS*. Modifications were made to item content. For example, Item 16R was originally "Off duty educational opportunities." The Military Life Satisfaction items are intended to assess members' satisfaction with various aspects of military life, including residence, work environment, education, and professional opportunities (see Table 4).

The alpha coefficients for the total sample and the sample of men were .81 and for women the coefficient was .82 (see Table 1). There are no recommendations for modifications to this scale.

Item 17, Commitment. In Items 17A-D, survey participants were asked the extent to which they agreed with statements about their Service (see Table 5). Response options ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 *(strongly agree)*. Item 17D was reverse scored (see Table 5).[8] A higher score denotes a higher degree of commitment to one's individual Service.

The Commitment scale consists of four items that were revised from Mowday, Steers, and Porter's (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. Items included in 2002 were modified from *1995 Form B*. The Commitment scale is intended to assess members' commitment to their individual Service.

When the alpha coefficients were initially computed, Item 17D had substantially lower item-total correlations (.42 in the total sample) than the other items (ranging from .63 to .73 in the total sample). It was removed from further analysis and the alpha coefficients for the scale improved from $\alpha = .80$ to $\alpha = .84$ for the total sample, $\alpha = .78$ to $\alpha = .83$ for men, and $\alpha = .82$ to $\alpha = .85$ for women. There are no recommendations for modifications to this scale.

---

[8] In Table 5 (and in subsequent tables), any item followed by an asterisk was reverse-coded; for example, on a 5-point scale, 1 became 5, 2 became 4, 4 became 2, and 5 became 1.

Table 4.
Scale Items Measuring Compensation, Medical Care, Child Care, and Military Life Satisfaction

---

Compensation Satisfaction

16A	Basic pay
16B	Special and incentive pays including bonuses
16C	Basic Allowance for Subsistence (BAS)
16D	Basic Allowance for Housing (BAH)
16E	Retirement pay you would get
16F	Cost of living adjustments (COLA) to retirement pay

Medical Care Satisfaction

16G	Availability of medical care for yourself
16H	Availability of medical care for your family
16I	Quality of medical care for yourself
16J	Quality of medical care for your family
16K	Out of pocket costs for medical care

Child care Satisfaction

16L	Availability of child care
16M	Quality of child care
16N	Affordability of child care

Military Life Satisfaction

16P	Quality of your current residence
16Q	Quality of your work environment (i.e., space, cleanliness, and maintenance and repair)
16R	Opportunities for civilian education
16S	Opportunities for professional development
16T	Level of care and concern shown by supervisors for subordinates
16U	Quality of leadership
16V	Your career, in general

Table 5.
Scale Items Measuring Commitment to Individual Service

Commitment

17A	Being a member of your Service inspires you to do the best job you can
17B	You are willing to make sacrifices to help your Service
17C	You are glad that you are part of your Service
17D*†	You are NOT willing to put yourself out to help your Service

---

*Reverse coded.
†Omitted from final version of Commitment scale.

Item 18, Passive and Active Exit Actions. In Items 18A-J, survey participants were asked whether in the past six months they had engaged in any of 10 activities to explore leaving the military (see Table 6). Responses were scored dichotomously, 0 (*no*) or 1 (*yes*). Higher scores denote that the respondent had engaged in a higher number of activities to explore leaving the military.

Table 6.
Scale Items Measuring Passive and Active Exit Actions

Passive and Active Exit Actions		
18A	Thought seriously about leaving the military	
18B	Wondered what life might be like as a civilian	
18C	Discussed leaving and/or civilian opportunities with family or friends	
18D	Talked about leaving with your immediate supervisor	
18E	Gathered information on education programs or colleges	
18F	Gathered information about civilian job options (for example, read newspaper ads, attended a job fair)	
18G	Attended a program that helps people prepare for civilian employment	
18H	Prepared a resume	
18I	Applied for a job	
18J	Interviewed for a job	

The Passive and Active Exit Actions scales are composed of items that were adopted or revised from the *1999 ADS*.[9] The items consist of two rationally constructed subscales that ask about steps that a member might take prior to leaving the military. The Passive Exit Actions scale includes six items that describe thoughts and information gathering activities that could act as precursors to more active steps toward organizational withdrawal (18A-F). The Active Exit Actions scale is composed of four items that describe focused activities related to withdrawal from the military (18G-J).

Alpha coefficients for the Passive Exit Actions subscale (Items 18A-F) for the full sample, for men, and for women were all .77. Reliability coefficients for the Active Exit Actions subscale (Items 18G-J) were .71 for the full sample, .68 for women, and .72 for men (see Table 1). For the total sample, women, and men, Item 16E had substantially lower item-total correlations (.27 in the total sample) than the other items (ranging from .46 to .66 in the total sample).

A two-factor confirmatory factor model using tetrachoric correlations and diagonally weighted least squares estimation (due to the dichotomous scoring used with this scale) was fitted to the data to test the rational grouping of the scales (18A-F, 18G-J). With the exception of

---

[9] Items 18C, 18D, and 18F, are slightly modified versions of items used in the *1999 ADS*. Modifications were made to item content. For example, 18C was originally listed as "Discussed leaving and/or civilian opportunities with family members or friends" in *1999 ADS*. The items in the *1999 ADS* were structured as a checklist, whereas a dichotomous (yes/no) scale was used for *2002 WGR*.

Item 18E, factor loadings were consistently high throughout the two subscales. The fit indices were acceptable; for example RMSEA = .05 and SRMR = .10 in the total sample (see Appendix A). Recommendations for the scale include either revising or dropping Item 18E.

Item 22, Enlistment Support. In Items 22A-D, survey participants were asked how positive or negative they are when talking with their children about military enlistment (see Table 7). Response options ranged from 1 (*very negative*) to 5 (*very positive*). A higher score indicates greater parental support for their children enlisting in the military.

The Enlistment Support scale is composed of four items that were originally utilized in the 2000 Military Exit Survey. Alpha coefficients were α = .80 for the full sample, α = .82 for women, and α = .79 for men. There are no recommendations for modifications to the scale.

Table 7.
Scale Items Measuring Enlistment Support

Enlistment Support	
22A	The military, in general
22B	Career opportunities in the military
22C	Serving in the military, but not as a career
22D	Part-time (National Guard/Reserve) opportunities in the military

Scales in the Workplace Information Section

Item 37, Army Azimuth Scale. In Items 37A-L, survey participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with statements regarding their immediate supervisor (see Table 8). Response options range from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) with an additional option of "*don't know*" (coded 99). The "*don't know*" option was recoded as a 3 and combined with the midpoint of "*neither agree nor disagree*" based on research indicating that a "*don't know*" option tends to act as a midpoint (Drasgow et al., 1999). A higher score indicates higher endorsement of supervisor quality.

The Army Azimuth scale consists of 12 items that were modified for administration to a DoD population from the AZIMUTH Short Scale (Keene, Halpin, & Spiegel, 1996; Mathieu, Klimoski, Rouse, & Marsh, 1997; Stewart, Kilcullen, & Hopkins, 1994). Each item in the Army Azimuth Scale represents a specific construct that was intended to be reported individually. However, all items (37A-L) measure leadership and can be combined into an overall scale with high reliability (e.g., α, total sample = .96; see Table 1). Items 37A-L can be then rationally organized into two subscales assessing qualities of military leadership: Initiating Structure and Consideration. The Initiating Structure subscale (Items 37A, 37C, 37E, 37J, 37K) taps aspects of leadership's approach to technical, task-oriented facets of the job, whereas the Consideration subscale (Items 37B, 37D, 37F, 37G, 37H, 37I, 37L) relates to leadership's ability to effectively interact with people in the workgroup.

The alpha coefficients for the overall scale (37A-L) were .96 in the total sample, .97 for women, and .96 for men (see Table 1). Reliabilities for the subscales in the women, men, and the total sample were quite high (e.g., alphas of .91 and .95 in the total sample for the Initiating Structure and Consideration subscales, respectively).

Table 8.
Scale Items Measuring Army Azimuth Scale

Army Azimuth Scale	
37A	Handling the technical-skills part of the job (fully understands the capabilities and limitations of equipment in the work group; demonstrates knowledge of tactical skills)
37B	Handling the people-skills part of the job (demonstrates effective interpersonal skills, listens attentively, demonstrates concern for individuals)
37C	Handling the conceptual-skills part of the job (thinks through decisions, recognizes and balances competing requirements, uses analytical techniques to solve problems)
37D	Communicating (provides clear direction, explains ideas so that they are easily understood, listens well, keeps others informed, and writes well)
37E	Decision-making (makes sound decisions in a timely manner, includes all relevant information in decisions and can generate innovative solutions to unique problems)
37F	Motivating (creates a supportive work environment, inspires people to do their best, acknowledges the good performance of others, and disciplines in a firm, fair, and consistent manner)
37G	Developing (encourages the professional growth of subordinates, is an effective teacher, uses counseling to provide feedback, provides the opportunity to learn, and delegates authority)
37H	Building (builds cohesive teams, gains the cooperation of all team members, encourages and participates in organizational and work group activities, focuses the work group on mission accomplishment)
37I	Learning (encourages open discussion that improves the organization, willingly accepts new challenges, helps the work group adapt to changing circumstances, recognizes personal limitations)
37J	Planning and organizing (develops effective plans to achieve organizational goals, anticipates how different plans will look when executed, sets clear priorities, willingly modifies plans when circumstances change)
37K	Executing (completes assigned missions to standards, monitors the execution of plans to identify problems, is capable of refining plans to exploit unforeseen opportunities)
37L	Assessing (accurately assesses the work group's strengths and weaknesses, conducts effective in-progress reviews and after-action reviews, takes time to find out what subordinate units are doing)

A two-factor model was fit using CFA. Looking across the fit indices in Appendix A suggested an acceptable fit. For example, RMSEA = .12, NNFI = .93, SRMR = .03, GFI = .88, AGFI = .83, and CFI = .95 in the total sample. However, the correlation between the two factors (Initiating Structure and Consideration) was .95. Given the high correlation, parsimony dictates that the scale should be considered unidimensional. A one-factor CFA was performed and although the fit statistics deteriorated to some degree (e.g., the RMSEA increased to .13 and SRMR to .04 in the total sample), the one-factor solution is preferred on the grounds of parsimony (see Appendix A). It is recommended that the "*don't know*" option be dropped, as participants can use the "*neither agree nor disagree*," option, so the "*don't know*" option does not appear to provide additional useful information.

Items 36 and 38, Careerism. In Items 36B, 38B, 38D 38E, 38F, survey participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with statements regarding their supervisors and other leaders (see Table 9). For Items 38B, 38D, 38E, and 38F, response options ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). A sixth option, "*don't know*," was originally scored as 99 and then rescored to a 3 and combined with the midpoint, "*neither agree nor disagree*." Item 36B had five response options ranging from 1 (*disagree*) to 5 (*agree*). Items 36B and 38D were reverse coded. Higher scores indicate higher perceptions of careerism among military members.

Created as an experimental measure of careerism for the *July 2002 Status of Forces Survey of Active-Duty Members*, this scale measures the extent to which leaders "put their careers ahead of all else" (Survey Results-Zero Defect and Related Measures, 2002). The scale originally contained 6 items.[10]

Alpha coefficients for the total sample, women, and men were .82, .83, and .81, respectively (see Table 1). For future versions of this scale, dropping the "*don't know*" option is recommended, as participants already have a middle option, "*neither agree nor disagree*," so the "*don't know*" option does not appear to provide any additional useful information.

Table 9.
Scale Items Measuring Careerism

Careerism	
36B*	If I make a request through channels in my work group, I know somebody will listen
38B	The leaders in your work group are more interested in looking good than being good
38D*	You would go for help with a personal problem to people in your chain of command
38E	The leaders in your work group are not concerned with the way Service members treat each other as long as the job gets done
38F	The leaders in your work group are more interested in furthering their careers than in the well-being of their Service members

*Reverse coded.

---

[10] A sixth item was not included in *2002 WGR*, as analysis revealed it did not significantly add to the measure. Additionally, scoring in the *July 2002 Status of Forces Survey of Active-Duty Members* consisted of a 5-point scale ranging from "*strongly disagree*" to "*strongly agree,*" with the middle option as "*?*"

Item 38, Supervisor Satisfaction. In Items 38A-I, survey participants were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed with statements about the leaders of their workgroup and other leaders in their chain of command (see Table 10). Response options ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). A sixth option, originally scored as 99 (*don't know*), was recoded as a 3 and combined with the mid-point (*neither agree nor disagree*). Items 38B, 38E, and 38F were reverse coded and higher scale scores denote a higher degree of satisfaction with one's immediate supervisors.

The Supervisor Satisfaction scale is composed of four items (38B, 38D, 38E, 38F) from the Careerism scale and five items created for *2002 WGR*. This scale is intended to assess member's satisfaction with supervisors and others in the immediate chain of command.

Alpha coefficients were .89 for the total sample, .90 for women, and .88 for men (see Table 1). A one-factor CFA model was fit and looking across the fit indices (e.g., RMSEA, NNFI, SRMR, GFI, AGFI, and CFI) indicated that the model did not fit the data as well as is desirable (see Appendix A). For example RMSEA = .14, NNFI = .86, SRMR = .06, GFI = .89, AGFI = .82, and CFI = .89 in the total sample. It is recommended that the "*don't know*" option be dropped as participants have the middle option, "*neither agree nor disagree*," and the "*don't know*" option does not appear to provide additional useful information.

Table 10.
Scale Items Measuring Supervisor Satisfaction

Supervisor Satisfaction	
38A	The leaders in your work group set high standards for Service members in terms of good behavior and discipline
38B*	The leaders in your work group are more interested in looking good than being good
38C	You are impressed with the quality of leadership in your work group
38D	You would go for help with a personal problem to people in your chain of command
38E*	The leaders in your work group are not concerned with the way Service members treat each other as long as the job gets done
38F*	The leaders in your work group are more interested in furthering their careers than in the well-being of their Service members
38G	Leaders in your work group treat Services members with respect
38H	Leaders most often get willing and whole-hearted cooperation from the Service members in your work group
38I	The NCOs/petty officers in your chain of command are a good source of support for Service members

*Reverse-coded.

Item 39, Coworker and Work Satisfaction. In Items 39A-L, survey participants were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with statements about their coworkers and the work they do (see Table 11). Response options ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). A higher score indicates more satisfying experiences with coworkers and work.

The Coworker Satisfaction scale consists of six items. Three items (Items 39A, 39C, and 39D) were modified from *1995 Form B*; Edwards, Elig, Edwards, & Riemer, 1997),[11] two (Items 39B and 39E) were adapted from Spector's (1997) Job Satisfaction Survey, and one (Item 39F) was created for *2002 WGR*. The Work Satisfaction scale consists of six items that were modified from *1995 Form B*.[12] The two scales were piloted on a sample of military personnel and found to have strong reliability coefficients (Ormerod et al., 2001).

Alpha coefficients for the Coworker Satisfaction scale were .91 for the total sample and for men, and .92 for women. Reliability coefficients were .91 for total sample, men, and women for the Work Satisfaction scale (see Table 1). In both scales, the items had acceptable item-total correlations (all between .50 and .80).

A two-factor model reflecting coworker satisfaction and work satisfaction (i.e., two facets of job satisfaction) was fit using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The fit indices (e.g., RMSEA, NNFI, SRMR, GFI, AGFI, and CFI) indicated that the model fit the data reasonably well (see Appendix A). For example, RMSEA = .07, NNFI = .96, SRMR = .03, GFI = .95, AGFI = .93, and CFI = .96 in the total sample (see Appendix A). Given the strong alpha coefficients, recommendations for future surveys include using item response theory analysis and exploring whether these two scales can be shortened by two items per scale.

---

[11] In Item 39A the response option originally reflected an amount (from "*very large extent*" to "*not at all*") and was reworded from a question ("Is there conflict among your co-workers?") to a statement. Items 39C and 39D were originally statements ("The amount of effort of your co-workers compared to your effort" and "The relationship you have with your coworkers," respectively) asking about satisfaction (from "*very satisfied*" to "*very dissatisfied*").

[12] Modifications were made to the format of the item and item content. Items 39G, 39H, and 39I were originally scored according to the extent that the member agreed with the statements along a 5-point scale ranging from "*not at all*" to a "*very large extent.*" For example, Item 39G was originally listed as "Does your work provide you with a sense of pride?" Items 39J, 38K, and 39L were originally scored according to the member's degree of satisfaction along a 5-point scale ranging from "*very satisfied*" to "*very dissatisfied*" and had slight content differences in *1995 Form B*. For example, Item 39J was originally listed as "The kind of work you do."

Table 11.
Scale Items Measuring Coworker and Work Satisfaction

Coworker Satisfaction

39A	There is very little conflict among your co-workers.
39B	You like your co-workers.
39C	Your co-workers put in the effort required for their jobs.
39D	You are satisfied with the relationships you have with your coworkers.
39E	The people in your workgroup tend to get along.
39F	The people in your workgroup are willing to help each other.

Work Satisfaction

39G	Your work provides you with a sense of pride.
39H	Your work makes good use of your skills.
39I	Your present assignment is good for your military career.
39J	You like the kind of work you do.
39K	Your job gives you the chance to acquire valuable skills.
39L	You are satisfied with your job as a whole.

Item 40, Workplace Hostility. In Items 40A-J, survey participants were asked to report how often in the past 12 months they were targeted with hostile behavior in the workplace (see Table 12). Response options ranged from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*very often*). A higher score denotes more workplace hostility.

The Workplace Hostility scale is composed of 9 items that were adopted or revised from the *Aggressive Experiences scale* (AES; Glomb & Liao, in press) [13] and an item created for this scale (Item 40I). This scale assesses the frequency with which a respondent was the target of aggressive, hostile, or disrespectful behavior at work. Originally a 20-item scale, the 10-item version was piloted on a sample of military personnel and found to have strong reliability and correlate significantly with outcomes (Ormerod et al., 2001).

Alpha coefficients for men, women, and total sample were .93 (see Table 1). All items had strong item-total correlations, with most above .70, and the alpha coefficients decreased if any item was removed.

This scale was intended to be unidimensional thus a one-factor model was fit using CFA. Examining the fit indices (e.g., RMSEA, NNFI, SRMR, GFI, AGFI, and CFI) suggested that the model was not fitting the data well (see Appendix A). For example, RMSEA = .16, NNFI = .85, SRMR = .05, GFI = .85, AGFI = .77, and CFI = .88 in the total sample. Therefore, to improve fit, the 10 items were paired, creating 5 multi-item composite items. Performing CFA on multi-item composites rather than on individual items allows for accurate examination of the factor structure while correcting for idiosyncrasies in individual items, particularly when the individual items have non-normal distributions. In this analysis Items 40C, 40D, 40F, and 40I had non-

---

[13] Item 40A was slightly modified from the original item. It originally read, "An angry tone of voice."

normal distributions in particular. Items were paired based on the following criteria: low inter-item correlations, dissimilar content, and dissimilar option endorsement frequencies. The following 5 pairs were created: 40AI, 40BG, 40CD, 40EJ, and 40HF. One-factor CFAs on the aggregated data were performed for the total sample, men only, and women only. The result was a marked improvement in all fit indices, except the RMSEA in men (see Appendix A). For example, RMSEA improved to .15, NNFI to .94, SRMR to .03, GFI to .95, AGFI to .86, and CFI to .97 in the total sample. There are no recommendations for future surveys.

Table 12.
Scale Items Measuring Workplace Hostility

Workplace Hostility	
40A	Using an angry tone of voice
40B	Avoiding you
40C	Making you look bad
40D	Yelling or raising one's voice
40E	Withholding information from you
40F	Swearing directed at you
40G	Talking about you behind your back
40H	Insulting, criticizing you (including sarcasm)
40I	Saying offensive or crude things about you
40J	Flaunting status or power over you

Scales in the Mentoring Section

Item 44, Army Mentoring Item. In Items 44A-P, survey participants were asked to rate the degree to which different types of assistance by a mentor is helpful (see Table 13). Response options ranged from 1 (*not at all helpful*) to 5 (*extremely helpful*). A response option, "*not provided*" = 72, was recoded as missing. A higher score denotes that mentor assistance is more helpful.

The Army Mentoring Item is composed of 16 items and is new to *2002 WGR*. Items were originally considered at the individual item-level to represent a unique aspect of the mentoring relationship. To better understand the role of mentoring, the items were rationally grouped into two subscales to reflect different types of mentoring. Career Development Mentoring (Items 44A-D, 44J, 44K, 44N-P) consists of nine items and is intended to measure whether mentoring aided career development by teaching skills and helping with advancement. Social Mentoring (44E-I, 44L, 44M) consists of seven items and is intended to measure the provision of social mentoring, such as providing psychosocial support and guidance.

Alpha coefficients for the Career Development Mentoring scale (Items 44A-D, 44J, 44K, 44N-P) were .91 for the total sample, men, and women and .92 for the Social Mentoring scale (Items 44E-I, 44L, 44M) for the total sample, men, and women (see Table 1).

In an effort to examine the rational grouping of the items into two scales, a cluster analyses was performed. Items 44F, 44J, 44K, and 44N did not cluster well with either factor or with each other and were removed from further analyses. Furthermore, the cluster analysis revealed three, instead of two, distinct clusters. These clusters were used as the basis for a three-factor confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Thus, a three-factor CFA was performed on the 12 remaining components of Item 44. The first factor, labeled Career Development, consisted of Items 44A, 44B, 44C, 44D (α = .88 for the total sample, men, and women). The second factor, called Sponsorship, contained Items 44O and 44P (α = .84 for total sample, men, and women). Finally, the third factor, Psychosocial, consisted of Items 44E, 44G, 44H, 44I, 44L, and 44M (α = .91 for total sample, men, and women; see Table 1). The three-factor CFA yielded an acceptable fit. For example, RMSEA = .11, NNFI = .97, SRMR = .04, GFI = .91, AGFI = .87, and CFI = .97 in the total sample (see Appendix A). However, to be thorough, a CFA conforming to the two-factor rational grouping described above was performed using all 16 items. The fit degraded somewhat and the 16-item, two-factor model did not achieve as good a fit as the 12-item, three-factor model (e.g., total sample RMSEA = .14, NNFI = .95, SRMR = .06, GFI = .79, AGFI = .72, and CFI = .96; see Appendix A). Finally, a CFA for a one-factor or null model was performed on the 16 items and the fit degraded further (e.g., total sample RMSEA = .15; see Appendix A). Thus, the 12-item, three-factor model provides the best fit to the data.

Much of the research done on mentoring, such as the seminal work of Kram (1985), has yielded two factors for mentoring, Career Development (which includes sponsorship) and Psychosocial Support. However, little research has focused on military samples. Thus, revisions of the mentoring scale could proceed in one of several ways. First, it is recommended that Items 44F, 44J, 44K, and 44N, be removed unless they are theoretically important to the overall construct of mentoring. Another direction that a revision could proceed is to develop the three-factor model of mentorship (i.e., Career Development/Sponsorship/Psychosocial). To accomplish this, the Sponsorship factor would need further development. Items 44O and 44P could be revised, and additional items written so that there are a minimum of four items for the Sponsorship subscale. A second, and different, way that a revision could take place is develop the two-factor model so that it better conforms to the literature. In this case, Items 44O and 44P could be dropped or revised to better fit with the Career Development factor.

Table 13.
Scale Items Measuring Mentoring

Mentoring

44A	Teaches job skills
44B	Gives feedback on your job performance
44C	Assigns challenging tasks
44D	Helps develop your skills/competencies for future assignments
44E	Provides support and encouragement
44F	Provides personal and social guidance
44G	Provides career guidance
44H	Demonstrates trust
44I	Acts as a role model
44J	Protects you
44K	Invites you to observe activities at his/her level
44L	Instills service core values
44M	Provides moral/ethical guidance
44N	Teaches/advises on organizational politics
44O	Provides sponsorship/contacts to advance your career
44P	Assists in obtaining future assignments

Scales in the Readiness, Health, and Well-Being Section

Item 50, General Health. In Items 50A-D, survey participants were asked to rate their health in general (see Table 14). Response options ranged from 1 (*definitely false*) to 4 (*definitely true*). Items 50B and 50C were reverse-scored so that a higher score indicates more positive perceptions of the member's general health.

The General Health scale is composed of four items. The items are based on the RAND-36. It can be found in the *Medical Outcomes Study* questionnaire (SF-36; Ware & Sherbourne, 1992)[14] which is derived from work by the Rand Corporation. These items were first included in *1995 Form B* and were revised for the 2002 instrument. The scale is intended to assess members' general health.

Alpha coefficients were .75 for the total sample and were similarly moderate for women and men (see Table 1). For men, women, and the total sample, Item 50B had somewhat low item-total correlations (.43 total sample, .39 male, .47 women). There are no recommendations for modifications to the scale.

Item 51, *Role Limitations due to Physical Health*. In Items 51A-D, survey participants were asked how much their physical health had limited their functioning over the past four weeks (see Table 14). Response options ranged from 1 (*little or none of the time*) to 4 (*all or*

---

[14] The original instrument included a mid-point response option of "*don't know*."

most of the time). A higher score indicates a greater negative impact of physical health on daily activities.

Table 14.
Scales Measuring Physical and Psychological Health

General Health

50A	I am as healthy as anybody I know
50B*	I seem to get sick a little easier than other people
50C*	I expect my health to get worse
50D	My health is excellent

Role Limitations due to Physical Health

51A	Cut down on the amount of time you spent on work or other activities
51B	Accomplished less than you would like
51C	Were limited in the kind of work or other activities you do
51D	Had difficulty performing the work or other activities you do (for example, it took extra effort)

Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems

52A	Cut down on the amount of time you spent on work or other activities
52B	Accomplished less than you would like
52C	Didn't do work or other activities as carefully as usual

Psychological Distress

53A*	Felt calm and peaceful
53B	Been a very nervous person
53C	Felt so down in the dumps that nothing could cheer you up
53D	Felt downhearted and blue
53E*	Been a happy person

---

*Reverse-coded.

The Role Limitations due to Physical Health scale is composed of four items and is based on the RAND-36. It can be found in the *Medical Outcomes Study* questionnaire (SF-36; Ware & Sherbourne, 1992)[15] which is derived from work by the Rand Corporation. *1995 Form B* utilized the dichotomous response scale and contained three items to measure this construct. The scale is intended to assess the impact of a member's physical health on their daily activities. Alpha coefficients for women, men, and the total sample were .89 (see Table 1). There are no recommendations for modifications to the scale.

Item 52, Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems. In Items 52A-C, survey participants were asked how much their emotional problems had limited their functioning over the past four weeks (see Table 14). Response options ranged from 1 (*little or none of the time*) to 4 (*all or most of the time*). A higher score indicates a greater negative impact of emotional health on daily activities.

The Role Limitations due to Emotional Problems scale was composed of three items and is based on the RAND-36. It can be found in the *Medical Outcomes Study* questionnaire (SF-36; Ware & Sherbourne, 1992)[16], which is derived from work by the Rand Corporation. *1995 Form B* utilized the dichotomous response scale. The scale is intended to assess the impact of a member's emotional problems on their daily activities. Alpha coefficients for women, men, and the total sample were .90 (see Table 1). There are no recommendations for modifications to the scale.

Item 53, Psychological Distress. In Items 53A-E, survey participants were asked how much time over the past four weeks they had experienced psychological distress (see Table 14). Response options ranged from 1 (*little or none of the time*) to 4 (*all or most of the time*). Items 53A and 53E were reverse-coded so that a higher score indicates greater psychological distress.

The Psychological Distress scale consists of five items and is based on the RAND-36[17]. It can be found in the *Medical Outcomes Study* questionnaire (SF-36; Ware & Sherbourne, 1992)[18] which is derived from work by the Rand Corporation. It can also be found as part of Veit and Ware's (1983) *Mental Health Inventory* (see Drasgow, et al., 1999 for a discussion of this measure as used in *1995 Form B*). *1995 Form B* utilized the six-point response scale.

Alpha coefficients for the Psychological Distress scale were .83 for the total sample, .84 for women, and .81 for men (see Table 1). However, some of the inter-item correlations were low (e.g., .38), particularly the one between 53B and 53E. Recommendations for future surveys include expanding the number of items so that psychological states such as anxiety and depression can be tapped.

---

[15] The original instrument utilized a dichotomous response scale.
[16] The original instrument utilized a dichotomous response scale.
[17] RAND-36 is a 36-Item Short Form Health Survey (SF-36) of quality-of-life measures developed by RAND.
[18] The original instrument utilized a six-point response scale and included the stem, "Have you" in every item.

Scales in the Gender-Related Experiences in the Military Section

Item 54, Discrimination. In Items 54A-N, survey participants were asked to report whether in the past 12 months they experienced adverse behaviors related to performance evaluations, assignments, and careers (see Table 15). The intent of these items was to measure discrimination; however, respondents were not asked if they considered what happened to them to be discrimination either because of gender or for another reason. Response options included 1 (*no, or does not apply*), 2 (*yes, but your gender was NOT a factor*), and 3 (*yes, and your gender was a factor*) for Items 54A-L and 54N. Item 54M utilized two response options, 0 (*no*) and 1 (*yes*). Item 54L ("You did not get a job assignment that you wanted and for which you were qualified") is predicated on Item 54M ("…was that assignment legally open to women?"), and these two items were combined to form Item 54LM. Thus, Item LM was scored such that scores on Items L and M were added to create a possible score of 1, 2, 3, or 4. Item 54N asks about any other adverse action (including a write-in option) and was not utilized in the following analyses. Item 54 is scored in one of two ways to reflect either discrimination experienced in the workplace regardless of gender (Workplace Discrimination) or Gender-Related Discrimination. Both scoring methods are described below.

Table 15.
Scale Items Measuring Discrimination

Discrimination	
54A	You were rated lower than you deserved on your last evaluation
54B	Your last evaluation contained unjustified negative comments
54C	You were held to a higher performance standard than others
54D	You did not get an award or a decoration given to others in similar circumstances
54E	Your current assignment has not made use of your job skills
54F	Your current assignment is not good for your career if you continue in the military
54G	You did not receive day-to-day, short-term tasks that would have helped you prepare for advancement
54H	You did not have a professional relationship with someone who advised (mentored) you on career development or advancement
54I	You did not learn-until it was too late-of opportunities that would have helped your career
54J	You were unable to get straight answers about your promotion possibilities
54K	You were excluded from social events important to career development and being kept informed
54L	You did not get a job assignment that you wanted and for which you were qualified
54M	If you answered "Yes, and your gender was a factor" to "l" above, was this assignment legally open to women?
54N	Have you had any other adverse personnel actions in the past 12 months? (If "Yes," please specify below.)

The *DMDC* developed a measure of perceived racial/ethnic discrimination in the workplace and included this measure in the *1996 Equal Opportunity Survey* (*1996 EOS*). This item tapped the dimensions of evaluations, assignments, and career discrimination. Based on results from *1996 EOS*, a gender version of the measure (i.e., Item 54) was developed for use in *2002 WGR*.

Workplace Discrimination consists of 12 items (54A-LM) that tap three facets of discrimination: Evaluation Discrimination-Workplace (Items 54A-D), Assignment Discrimination-Workplace (Items 54E-G, and 54LM), and Career Discrimination-Workplace (Items 54H-K). Scores on Items 54A-K were recoded so that any score of a 2 or 3 (i.e., either "*yes*" response) was recoded to 1 and scores of 1 (i.e., "*no*") were recoded to 0. Scores on Item 54LM were recoded so that any score of 2, 3, or 4, was recoded to 1 and scores of 1 were recoded to 0. Therefore, respondents received a score of 1 = experienced Workplace Discrimination or 0 = did not experience Workplace Discrimination. A higher score indicates a higher perception of Evaluation, Assignment, or Career Discrimination-Workplace.

Alpha coefficients were .76 for Items 54A-LM, .49 for Evaluation Discrimination-Workplace (54A-D), .61 for Assignment Discrimination-Workplace (54E-G, and 54LM) and .62 for Career Discrimination-Workplace (54H-K) in the total sample (see Table 1).

A one-factor model and a three-factor model conforming to the three types of discrimination described above (i.e., Evaluation, Assignment, Career) were fit using confirmatory factor analysis using tetrachoric correlations and diagonally-weighted least squares estimation –appropriate for the nature of the data. The one-factor model attained relatively adequate fit (RMSEA = .057, SRMR = .077, see Appendix A for a summary of the complete results). However, the three-factor model exhibited a better fit than the fit attained with the one-factor model. For example, RMSEA = .036, SRMR = .057 (see Appendix A).

Gender-Related Discrimination consists of 12 items (54A-LM) that tap three facets of discrimination: Evaluation Discrimination (Items 54A-D), Assignment Discrimination (Items 54E-G, and 54LM), and Career Discrimination (Items 54H-K). Scores on Items 54A-K were recoded so that any score of 3 (i.e., *yes, and*) was recoded to 1 and scores of 1 or 2 were recoded to 0. Scores on Item 54LM were recoded so that any score of 4 was recoded to 1 and scores of 1, 2, or 3 were recoded to 0. Thus, respondents received a score of 1 = experienced gender-related discrimination or 0 = did not experience gender-related adverse actions.

Alpha coefficients (see Table 1) were .81 for Items 54A-LM, .65 for Evaluation Discrimination (54A-D), .65 for Assignment Discrimination (54E-G, 54LM) and .71 for Career Discrimination (54H-K) for the total sample. Item 54LM did not function as well for men as for women (the alpha increases from .57 to .61 if it is removed) on the assignment discrimination subscale. However, it is an item important for measuring the experiences of women and was left in the scale.

As with the workplace form of this scale, a one-factor model and a three-factor model were fit to these data based on tetrachoric correlations and diagonally-weighted least squares estimation. Again, the one-factor model attained relatively good fit (RMSEA = .022, SRMR = .069, see Appendix A). As with the previous analyses, the three-factor model exhibited better fit (RMSEA = .011, SRMR = .040, see Appendix A). Thus, the three-factor model was accepted as best representing the data for both Workplace and Gender-Related Discrimination (based on the fit statistics appropriate for the nature of the data and the choice of method, RMSEA and SRMR).

Items 55 and 56, Unprofessional, Gender-Related Behaviors scales. In Items 55A-S, survey participants were asked to report how often in the past 12 months they were targeted with unprofessional, gender-related behavior (see Table 16). Items 55A-R ask about specific behaviors and Item 55S, which includes an option for write-in responses, asks about "Other unwanted gender-related behavior" and is not included in scales or analyses. For each of the questions, respondents were asked about "unwanted" and "uninvited" talk and/or behaviors involving military personnel or civilian employees or contractors. Response options ranged from 0 (*never*) to 4 (*very often*). A higher score denotes more experiences of unwanted gender-related behavior.

Table 16.
Scale Items Measuring Unprofessional, Gender-Related Behaviors

---

Sexist Behavior

55B	Referred to people of your gender in insulting or offensive terms?
55D	Treated you "differently" because of your gender (for example, mistreated, slighted, or ignored you)?
55G	Made offensive sexist remarks (for example, suggesting that people of your gender are not suited for the kind of work you do)?
55I	Put you down or was condescending to you because of your gender?

Crude/Offensive Behavior

55A	Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you?
55C	Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters (for example, attempted to discuss or comment on your sex life)?
55E	Made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities?
55F	Made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature that embarrassed or offended you?

Unwanted Sexual Attention

55H	Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it?
55J	Continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said "No?"
55M	Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable?
55N	Made unwanted attempts to stroke, fondle, or kiss you?

Sexual Coercion

55K	Made you feel like you were being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behavior?
55L	Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative (for example, by mentioning an upcoming review)?
55O	Treated you badly for refusing to have sex?
55P	Implied faster promotions or better treatment if you were sexually cooperative?

Sexual Assault

55Q	Attempted to have sex with you without your consent or against your will, but was not successful?
55R	Had sex with you without your consent or against your will?

Other Unprofessional Behavior

55S	Other unwanted gender-related behavior? (unless you mark "never," please describe below.)

In Item 56, survey participants were asked whether they considered any of the behaviors that they experienced in Item 55 to have been sexual harassment. Response options included 0 (*none were sexual harassment*), 1 (*some were sexual harassment*), 2 (*all were sexual harassment*), and 61 (*does not apply*). Item 56 was used with Item 55 to calculate the incident rate for sexual harassment (described below).

The 18 items making up 55A-R represent a spectrum of unprofessional, gender-related behaviors and, along with Item 56, are divided into subscales (Sexist Behavior, Crude/Offensive Behavior, Unwanted Sexual Attention, Sexual Coercion, Sexual Assault and the DoD Sexual Harassment Core Measure). Sexist Behavior (Items 55B, D, G, I) includes verbal/nonverbal behaviors that convey insulting, offensive, and condescending attitudes based on the gender of the member. Crude/Offensive Behavior (Items 55A, C, E, F) are verbal/nonverbal behaviors of a sexual nature that are offensive or embarrassing. Unwanted Sexual Attention (Items 55H, J, M, and N) includes attempts to establish a sexual relationship, touching, or fondling. Sexual Coercion (Items 55K, L, O, and P) is classic *quid pro quo* instances of job benefits or losses conditioned on sexual cooperation. Sexual Assault (Items 55Q, R) are attempted and/or actual sexual relations without the member's consent and against his/her will. The DoD Sexual Harassment Core Measure includes the 12 items that measure Crude/Offensive Behavior, Unwanted Sexual Attention, and Sexual Coercion (Items 55A, C, E, F, H, J, K, L, M, N, O, P) and Item 56. When measured without Item 56, Items 55A, C, E, F, H, J, K, L, M, N, O, P are referred to as "Behaviors Indicative of Sexual Harassment."[19] The items, grouped according to subscale, can be seen in Table 16.

To report incident rates for Sexist Behavior, Crude/Offensive Behavior, Unwanted Sexual Attention, Sexual Coercion, Sexual Assault, and Behaviors Indicative of Sexual Harassment, a one-step counting process is utilized, that is, did the individual indicate experiencing at least one of the behaviors in that of a category (response options "*once or twice*" to "*very often*") in the previous 12 months.

To report an incident rate for the "DoD Sexual Harassment Core Measure," the counting algorithm utilizing a two-step process is conducted. This counting algorithm can be depicted as follows:

1. Respondent indicates experiencing any of 12 sexual harassment behaviors (55A, C, E, F, H, J, K, L, M, N, O, P) at least once in the past 12 months, and

2. Indicates at least some of the behaviors experienced were sexual harassment (a score of 1 or 2 on Item 56).

---

[19] Survey measurement of sexual harassment is defined by the U.S. Department of Defense as the presence of behaviors indicative of sexual harassment (Crude/Offensive Behavior, Sexual Coercion, and Unwanted Sexual Attention; Sexist Behavior and Sexual Assault are not counted in the DoD survey measure of sexual harassment) and the labeling of those behaviors as sexual harassment (Survey Method for Counting Incidents of Sexual Harassment, 2002).

These rates are reported as percentages, computed by dividing the number of respondents who match the criteria for the measure (e.g., indicated that a behavior occurred at least once) by the total number of respondents who completed surveys. To be counted as a complete survey the respondent must have provided (a) at least one response (never, once or twice, sometimes, often, very often) in Item 55 and (b) answered at least 50% of non-skippable items on the survey.

Items 55A-R are based on the *Sexual Experiences Questionnaire*[20] (SEQ; Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Fitzgerald, Gelfand, & Drasgow, 1995). The SEQ is a widely used instrument that contains multiple items assessing participants' experiences of sexual harassment and other unprofessional, gender-related behavior. It has excellent psychometric properties (Fitzgerald et al., 1995; Gelfand, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 1995) and was identified as the best paper-and-pencil instrument available for assessing sexual harassment experiences (Arvey & Cavanaugh, 1995). The SEQ was modified to be applicable to a military setting (Fitzgerald, Magley, Drasgow, & Waldo, 1999) for *1995 Form B*. The 1995 measure included 25[21] items and was revised to 19 items in 2002. Three subscales (Crude/Offensive Behavior, Unwanted Sexual Attention, and Sexual Coercion) were shortened to four items each by subjecting them to item response theory analysis (Stark, Chernyshenko, Lancaster, Drasgow, & Fitzgerald, 2002). The Sexist Behavior subscale, also four items, contains three items from *1995 Form B* and one item new to *2002 WGR* (Item 55B).[22]

Reliability coefficients for the subscales range from .78 to .92 in the total sample and are listed in Table 1. Confirmatory factor analyses of Items 55A-P using tetrachoric correlations (using dichotomized responses) and diagonally-weighted least squares estimation were carried out fitting the four-factor structure to the data (Sexist Behavior, Crude/Offensive Behavior, Unwanted Sexual Attention, Sexual Coercion). A four-factor structure fit the data well (16 items). The fit indices (e.g., RMSEA and SRMR) suggested that the model had a good fit to the data. For example in the total sample the RMSEA was .02 and SRMR was .04 (see Appendix A).

Recommendations for future surveys include moving the placement of items 55M and 55N, as they assess physical, unwanted sexual attention and correlate highly; and moving items 55H and 55J, which assess verbal unwanted sexual attention. The CFA model fit may be improved by not allowing them to appear consecutively in future administrations.

Items 57-75 refer to the one situation that had the greatest effect on the individual and ask about the events that constituted the situation, where it occurred, and who was involved. Respondents were also asked: how the situation had affected them and how they coped with it; a

---

20 The civilian version of the SEQ uses somewhat different labels and combinations of the subscales based on factor analysis of civilian data (Gelfand, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 1995). It refers to participants' experiences in three general categories: gender harassment (gender harassment includes those behaviors referred to as Sexist Behavior and Crude/Offensive Behavior in the military), unwanted sexual attention (which includes sexual assault in civilian contexts), and sexual coercion (Gelfand et al., 1995).
[21] Originally 26 items, an item was deleted from *1995 Form B* because it did not fit with the theoretical framework and furthermore yielded very little variance.
[22] Other changes from *1995 Form B* to *2002 WGR* include four instances of changing the word "sex" to "gender," changing the word "which" to "that," and changing the word "unsuccessful" to "not successful."

series of questions about the reporting process; whether they experienced retaliation as a result of their experiences; and their satisfaction with how the situation was handled.

Item 57, Behaviors in the One Situation. In Items 57A-S, survey participants were presented with the same behaviors as in Item 55A-S and asked to "Think about the situation(s) you experienced during the past 12 months that involved the behaviors you marked in Question 55. Now pick the situation "that had the greatest effect on you" and then indicate those behaviors that occurred during this situation (see Table 17). Response options were 0 (*did not do this*) and 1 (*did this*). A higher score denotes more unprofessional, gender-related behaviors in the situation with the greatest effect.

The One Situation is composed of 19 items that are categorized into subscales, Sexist Behavior (55B, 55D, 55G, 55I), Crude/Offensive Behavior (57A, 57C, 57E, 57F), Unwanted Sexual Attention (57H, 57J, 57M, 57N), Sexual Coercion (57K, 57L, 57O, 57P), and Sexual Assault (57Q, 57R), plus an item (57S) that asked whether respondents experienced "other unwanted gender-related behavior." Items 57A-S are predicated on Item 55[23] and were pilot tested in the *Status of the Armed Forces Survey Pilot Forms A* and *B-Gender Issues* (Ormerod et al., 2001).[24] This scale assesses the number and type of behaviors that were experienced in the One Situation with the Greatest Effect. Alpha coefficients for the subscales in the total sample range from .40 to .80 (see Table 1). It is not unusual for lower coefficients to be seen due to subscales with smaller numbers of items. Analyses fitting a four-factor structure (Sexist Behavior, Crude/Offensive Behavior, Unwanted Sexual Attention, Sexual Coercion) to the data for Items 57A-P were conducted using tetrachoric correlations and diagonally-weighted least squares estimation. As in Item 55, a four-factor structure fit the data well. The fit indices (e.g., RMSEA and SRMR) suggest that the model had a good fit to the data. For example the obtained SRMR's were .07, .09, and .06 for women, men, and the entire sample, respectively and the RMSEA's were .04, .06, and .03 for women, men, and the entire sample, respectively (see Appendix A). As per recommendations for Item 55, if any items within the Unprofessional, Gender-Related Behaviors scales are to be reordered, such changes should be reflected in Item 57.

Item 58, Subjective Distress. In Items 58A-F, survey participants were asked to indicate the degree to which the One Situation (i.e., those behaviors endorsed in Item 57) was distressing (see Table 18). Response options ranged from 0 (*not at all*) to 4 (*extremely*). A higher score reflects personal appraisals of greater distress.

The first four items in Table 18 can be found in *1995 Form B* (Drasgow et al., 1999). Two items that capture additional aspects of distress (Items 58E and 58F) were added following pilot testing (Ormerod et al., 2001). With the addition of these two items, the Subjective Distress scale was rationally divided into two subscales, Subjective Distress I (Items 58A, 58B, 58C, 58E), which is intended to tap offensive aspects of distress, and Subjective Distress II (Items 58D and 58F), which represents a threatening facet of distress.

---

[23] Items 57A-S are identical to Items 55A-S. However, Item 57 uses a dichotomous response option rather than the 5-option response scale used in Item 55.

[24] Items 57B, 57D, 57G, and 57I were not included as part of the pilot study.

Table 17.
Scale Items Measuring the One Situation With The Greatest Effect

Sexist Behavior

57B	Referred to people of your gender in insulting or offensive terms?
57D	Treated you "differently" because of your gender (for example, mistreated, slighted, or ignored you)?
57G	Made offensive sexist remarks (for example, suggesting that people of your gender are not suited for the kind of work you do)?
57I	Put you down or was condescending to you because of your gender?

Crude/Offensive Behavior

57A	Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you?
57C	Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters (for example, attempted to discuss or comment on your sex life)?
57E	Made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities?
57F	Made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature that embarrassed or offended you?

Unwanted Sexual Attention

57H	Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it?
57J	Continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said "No?"
57M	Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable?
57N	Made unwanted attempts to stroke, fondle, or kiss you?

Sexual Coercion

57K	Made you feel like you were being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behavior?
57L	Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative (for example, by mentioning an upcoming review)?
57O	Treated you badly for refusing to have sex?
57P	Implied faster promotions or better treatment if you were sexually cooperative?

Sexual Assault

57Q	Attempted to have sex with you without your consent or against your will, but was not successful?
57R	Had sex with you without your consent or against your will?

Other Unprofessional Behavior

57S	Other unwanted gender-related behavior? (unless you mark "never," please describe below.)

Table 18.
Scale Items Measuring Subjective Distress

Subjective Distress

58A	Annoying?
58B	Offensive?
58C	Disturbing?
58D	Threatening?
58E	Embarrassing?
58F	Frightening?

The alpha reliability coefficients in the full sample were .86 for Subjective Distress I and .87 for Subjective Distress II (see Table 1). Based on preliminary analyses (principal components analysis and cluster analysis) Items 58A, 58B, and 58C clustered tightly into one factor (Subjective Distress I). Item 58E ("Embarrassing") was loosely associated with this factor and Items 58D and 58F were tightly clustered into a second factor (Subjective Distress II). Multidimensional scaling with the six items suggested that Item 58E exists on a separate dimension from the two dimensions described above.

A two-factor confirmatory factor analysis model, conforming to Subjective Distress I and II, using maximum likelihood estimation fit the data reasonably well. For example, RMSEA = .13, NNFI= .93, SRMR= .05, GFI= .96, AGFI= .89, and CFI= .96 in the total sample (see Appendix A). However, the modification index for Lambda X indicated that Item 58E might also load on the Subjective Distress II factor (i.e., the modification index for Item 58E on Distress II was 491.07).

Recommendations for this scale include either strengthening the two-factor model (e.g., offense and threat) by increasing the number of items on both factors, and dropping Item 58E. Alternately, further work could be done to explore whether Item 58E represents a third factor (e.g., Embarrassment) that might be strengthened.

Item 65, Coping. In Items 65A-R, survey participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they utilized specific, non-reporting coping strategies (e.g., behaviors other than filing formal reports) in response to the One Situation (see Table 19). Response options ranged from 0 (*not at all*) to 4 (*very large extent*). A higher score indicates that the respondent used the strategy to a greater extent.

Items 65A-Q are categorized into four scales, Internal Coping – Cognitive Avoidance (65B, 65E, 65L, 65N, 65O, 65Q), External Coping–Social Support (65F, 65G, 65H, 65I, 65P), External Coping–Confrontation (65C, 65K, 65M), and External Coping–Behavioral Avoidance (65A, 65D, 65J) and are considered to be a collection of individual scales rather than parts of one general scale.

The four coping scales are modified versions of subscales from the *Coping with Harassment Questionnaire* (CHQ; Fitzgerald, 1990).[25] Coping responses are thought to be used by targets of harassment to manage the harassing situation and/or their feelings in response to that situation. Researchers (e.g., Fitzgerald, Swan, & Magley, 1997) have proposed that there are two general coping styles (internal and external) that can be employed by targets of harassment. These two types are not considered to be mutually exclusive and are based on Lazarus and Folkman's (1984) problem-focused and emotion-focused coping styles. Internal coping is represented by more cognitively-oriented responses such as ignoring the behavior whereas external coping is represented by more active responses such as avoidance or assertion. Items 65A, 65G, 65I, and 65K are modified versions of items utilized in the *Status of the Armed Forces Survey 1995 Form B–Gender Issue*s (*1995 Form B*).[26] The Coping scales in *2002 WGR* are intended to assess non-reporting coping strategies.

Alpha coefficients for the total sample, women, and men ranged from .70 to .90 (see Table 1). There are no recommendations for modifications to the scale.

Item 66, Reporting Behavior. In Items 66A-E, survey participants were asked to indicate whether and to whom the respondent reported the One Situation (see Table 20). Response options ranged from 0 (*no*) to 1 (*yes*). A higher item score indicates that the respondent endorsed reporting the One Situation to the queried individual or group.

Originally introduced in *1995 Form B*, the items were created to determine the channels that a target of unprofessional gender-related behavior took to report these behaviors, and as such, were not necessarily intended as scale-tapping a theoretical construct.[27] Rather, these items measure behaviors and are intended to be used individually. There are no recommendations for modifications to the scale.

Items 69 and 72, Satisfaction with Reporting and Satisfaction with Reporting and Outcome. In Items 69A-E, participants were asked to indicate how satisfied they were with the reporting process (see Table 21). Response options ranged from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). A higher score indicates a greater degree of satisfaction with the reporting process.

Items 69A-D were originally utilized in *1995 Form B*.[28] Item 69E is a new item. The five-item Satisfaction with Reporting scale is intended to assess a respondent's satisfaction with the reporting process.

---

[25] The original CHQ consisted of fifty items, included additional subscales, and the response options ranged from 1 (*not at all descriptive)* to 5 *(very descriptive)*.

[26] Changes to items include changes in wording (e.g., Item 65A was listed as "I avoided the person") from *1995 Form B*.

[27] Items 66A-E are slightly modified versions of items found on *1995 Form B*. Items contain content modifications. For example Item 66C was originally listed as "The supervisor of the person who was bothering me" in *1995 Form B*. Scoring options in *1995 Form B* used four response options assessing whether the behavior was reported and if reporting made "things better, or worse for you."

[28] Items 68A-D are slightly modified versions of items found on *1995 Form B*. Modifications were made to item content. For example, Item 68A was originally listed as "The availability of information about how to report or file a complaint" in *1995 Form B*.

Table 19.
Scale Items Measuring Coping

Internal Coping–Cognitive Avoidance

65B	Try to forget it?
65E	Tell yourself it was not really important?
65L	Just put up with it?
65N	Blame yourself for what happened?
65O	Assume the person(s) meant well?
65Q	Pretend not to notice, hoping the person(s) would leave you alone?

External Coping

Confrontation

65C	Tell the person(s) you didn't like what he or she was doing?
65K	Tell the person(s) to stop?
65M	Ask the person(s) to leave you alone?

Use of Social Support Network

65F	Talk to some of your family about the situation?
65G	Talk to some of your coworkers about the situation?
65H	Talk to some of your friends about the situation?
65I	Talk to a chaplain or counselor about the situation?
65P	Pray about it?

Behavioral Avoidance

65A	Try to avoid the person(s) who bothered you?
65D	Stay out of the person's or persons' way?
65J	Try to avoid being alone with the person(s).

Other

65R	Do something else in response to the situation?

Table 20.
Scale Items Measuring Reporting Behavior

Reporting Behavior

66A	My immediate supervisor
66B	Someone else in your chain-of-command (including your commanding officer)
66C	Supervisor(s) of the person(s) who did it
66D	Special military office responsible for handling these kinds of complaints (for example, Military Equal Opportunity of Civil Rights Office)
66E	Other installation/Service/DoD person or office with responsibility for follow-up

---

Alpha coefficients for the total sample, women, and men ranged from .89 to .94 (see Table 1). It is possible to remove Item 69A without meaningfully affecting the scale's alpha coefficient. However, a decision about whether to retain Item 69A should be guided by whether it is substantively meaningful to the construct of reporting satisfaction. Inter-item correlations were moderate to high suggesting that this scale taps one dimension (ranging from .40 to .82 in the total sample).

In Item 72, participants were asked to indicate how satisfied they were with the outcome of their complaint (see Table 21). Response options ranged from 1 *(very dissatisfied)* to 5 *(very satisfied)*. Item 72 can be found on *1995 Form B*.[29] When combined with Items 69A-E, this six-item scale is referred to as Satisfaction with Reporting and Outcome and is intended to measure satisfaction with the reporting process and with the outcome of the complaint. Alpha coefficients range from .90 to .93 in the total sample, women, and men (see Table 1). There are no recommendations for modifications to either scale.

Table 21.
Scale Items Measuring Satisfaction with Reporting and Outcome

---

Satisfaction with the Complaint Process

69A	Availability of information about how to file a complaint
69B	Treatment by personnel handling your complaint
69C	Amount of time it took/is taking to resolve your complaint
69D	How well you are/were kept informed about the progress of your complaint
69E	Degree to which your privacy is/was being protected
72	How satisfied were you with the outcome of your complaint?

Item 74, Non-Reporting. In Items 74A-S, survey participants were asked to indicate their reasons for not reporting the behaviors that were endorsed in the One Situation (see Table 22). Response options ranged from 0 *(no)* to 1 *(yes)*. A higher item score indicates that the respondent endorsed the item as a reason for not reporting.

Items similar to Items 74A-B, 74D, 74F-G, 74I-P, and 74S were utilized in *1995 Form B,* but the presentation was that of a checklist rather than the current dichotomous scale.[30] Items 74A-S are intended to function as a scale and tap several broad classes of reasons for not

---

[29] The item was asked in the present tense on *1995 Form B*.
[30] Items 74A-B, 74D, 74F-G, 74I-P, and 74S are slightly modified versions of items used in *1995 Form B*. Modifications were made to item content and pilot tested in a sample of military personnel (Ormerod et al., 2001). For example, Item 74A was originally listed as "I did not think it was that important" in *1995 Form B*.

reporting the unprofessional, gender-related behaviors endorsed in Item 57. However, examination of the factor structure was inconclusive and these items appear to function more like a behavioral list than a scale. Thus, reliability coefficients are not provided in Table 1.

Based on a rational grouping of the items, a four-factor (retaliation/fear, isolation/discomfort, futility, and warned) exploratory factor analysis using principal axis factoring with varimax rotation was performed. The solution accounted for slightly less than 42% of the variance and the factor loadings were moderate to weak. For example, Item 74D double-loaded onto two factors at -.19 each. Applying an *a priori* cut-off of .40 excluded several highly endorsed items from the factor structure interpretation. Recommendations include further analyses of non-reporting behaviors, perhaps examining them by whether the respondent reported some or none of the behaviors endorsed in Item 57, and expanding the dichotomous response scale to include a mid-point response option of "uncertain."

Table 22.
Scale Items Measuring Non-reporting

Non-reporting

74A	Was not important enough to report
74B	You did not know how to report
74C	You felt uncomfortable making a report
74D	You took care of the problem myself
74E	You talked to someone informally in your chain-of-command
74F	You did not think anything would be done if you reported
74G	You thought you would not be believed in you reported
74H	You thought your coworkers would be angry if you reported
74I	You wanted to fit in
74J	You thought reporting would take too much time and effort
74K	You thought you would be labeled a troublemaker if you reported
74L	A peer talked you out of making a formal complaint
74M	A supervisor talked you out of making a formal complaint
74N	You did not want to hurt the person's or persons' feelings, family, or career
74O	You thought your performance evaluation or chance for promotion would suffer if you reported
74P	You were afraid of retaliation or reprisals from the person(s) who did it
74Q	You were afraid of retaliation or reprisals from friends/associates of the person(s) who did it
74R	You were afraid of retaliation or reprisals from your supervisors or chain-of-command
74S	Some other reason

Item 75, Retaliation. In Items 75A-L, survey participants were asked to indicate whether or not they experienced retaliatory behaviors as a result of the One Situation or their response to the One Situation (see Table 23). Response options, 1 (*yes*), 0 (*no*), and 99 (*don't know*), were recoded to 1 (*no*), 2 (*don't know*), and 3 (*yes*), based on research indicating that a "*don't know*" option tends to act as a midpoint (Drasgow et al., 1999). A higher score denotes greater amounts of retaliation.

The Retaliation scale is new to Form 2000GB. Retaliation related to workplace harassment is thought to include two types, personal (e.g., isolating and targeting victims of harassment with hostile interpersonal behaviors) and professional (e.g., behaviors that interfere with career advancement and retention) reprisals that may contribute differentially to outcomes (Cortina & Magley, in press; Fitzgerald et al., in preparation). Thus, the Retaliation scale was rationally organized into two factors, Personal Retaliation (75A-C) and Professional Retaliation (75D-K). An additional item (75L) asked whether respondents were "mistreated in some other way" and was not included in analyses. The Retaliation scale is intended to assess the degree to which members were retaliated against as a result of their response to the One Situation or the situation itself.

Alpha coefficients for the total sample, women, and men ranged from .76 to .91 (see Table 1). A two-factor confirmatory factor model using tetrachoric correlations and diagonally weighted least squares estimation (due to the scoring of the scale) revealed a good fit of the two-factor model (described above). The fit indices were acceptable; for example RMSEA = .04 and SRMR = .03 in the total sample (see Appendix A). However, the two factors were highly correlated (.87) indicating that the scale may be unidimensional. A one-factor CFA was performed and, although the fit degraded somewhat (e.g., RMSEA = .06 and SRMR = .05 in the total sample), it was deemed as the most parsimonious solution (see Appendix A).

If a future goal is to shorten the retaliation scale, the only possibility for data reduction lies with the Professional Retaliation subscale. Cutting items from the Personal Retaliation subscale is not recommended because it consists of only three items. In addition, the Personal Retaliation subscale could be expanded to include a minimum of 4 items for adequate reliability and to appropriately sample instantiations of the underlying construct. Given that no items perform poorly in the Professional Retaliation subscale, item reduction should be guided by substantive rationale and item response theory analyses.

Table 23.
Scale Items Measuring Retaliation

Personal

75A	You were ignored by others at work
75B	You were blamed for the situation
75C	People gossiped about you in an unkind or negative way

Professional

75D	You lost perks/privileges that you had before
75E	You were given less favorable job duties
75F	You were denied an opportunity for training
75G	You were given an unfair performance evaluation
75H	You were unfairly disciplined
75I	You were denied a promotion
75J	You were transferred to a less desirable job
75K	You were unfairly demoted

Other
    75L   You were mistreated in some other way

        Items 76, 77, 78, Sexual Harassment Climate. In Items 76A-I, 77A-I, and 78A-I, survey participants were asked to indicate whether they agreed with statements about the climate for unprofessional, gender-related behavior within their workgroup (see Table 24). Respondents were presented with a hypothetical scenario for Crude/Offensive Behavior (Item 76), Unwanted Sexual Attention (Item 77), and Sexual Coercion (Item 78). Following each scenario, response options ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree)*. Items 76B, 77B, 78B, 76C, 77C, 78C, 76E, 77E, 78E, 76G, 77G, and 78G were reverse coded. A higher score indicates greater individual perception of organizational climate that is tolerant of unprofessional, gender-related behavior.

        Items 76A-D, 77A-D, and 78A-D are new to *2002 WGR* and were rationally constructed to reflect perceptions of climate for Crude/Offensive Behavior, Unwanted Sexual Attention, and Sexual Coercion, respectively. Respondents were asked to rate perceptions of coworker or leadership response if the unprofessional, gender-related behavior were to occur. Items 76E-G, 77E-G, and 78E-G were adapted for the military context from the *Organizational Tolerance of Sexual Harassment* scale (OTSH; Hulin, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 1996).[31] The OTSH assesses the climate for sexual harassment within work groups or larger organizational units. Items 76E, 77E, 78E ask if a coworker were to complain about the unprofessional, gender-related behavior, whether the complaint would be taken seriously. Items 76F, 77F, and 78F assess perceptions about the risk involved if a coworker were to complain and Items 76G, 77G, and 78G measure perceptions that corrective action would be taken following the complaint. Items 76H-I, 77H-I, and 78H-I were rationally constructed to reflect additional responses to a complaint about unprofessional, gender-related behavior. Items 76H, 77H, and 78H appear to represent climate for retaliation.

        The alpha coefficient for Items 76A-D, 77A-D, and 78A-D in the full sample were .85, .83, and .83, respectively. The alpha coefficient for Items 76E-76G, 77E-77G, and 78E-78G in the full sample is .91, demonstrating high internal consistency. Alpha coefficients for males and females were similar (see Table 1). The alpha coefficient for 76H, 77H, and 78H is .84 for the total sample and women and .83 for men. Alpha coefficients are not reported for Items 76I, 77I, and 78I as it does not form a scale. Recommendations for future surveys include dropping Items 76I, 77I, 78I as they are similar in content to Items 76D, 77D, and 78D.

---

[31] The OTSH assesses individual perceptions of organizational tolerance for sexual harassment along scenarios about gender harassment (called Crude and Offensive Behavior in a military context), unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion. Response options ask if a complaint was made by the respondent, whether the respondent would incur risk, be taken seriously, or if corrective action would be taken.

Table 24.
Scale Items Measuring Sexual Harassment Climate

Sexual Harassment Climate

Suppose that a coworker at your duty station were to talk a lot at work about sex, trying to get others to talk about it, too.

    If a coworker at your duty station were to do this…

76A	Others in the unit would not care
76B*	The coworker would get in trouble with his or her supervisor
76C*	Others in the unit would tell the coworker to stop
76D	Leadership would ignore it

    If another coworker were to complain about this…

76E*	The complaint would be taken seriously
76F	It would be risky for the person making the complaint
76G*	Some corrective action would be taken
76H	Other coworkers would treat the person who made the complaint badly
76I	The complaint would be ignored

Suppose a coworker at your duty station were to keep asking others for dates even after they have made it clear that they are not interested.

    If a coworker at your duty station were to do this…

77A	Others in the unit would not care
77B*	The coworker would get in trouble with his or her supervisor
77C*	Others in the unit would tell the coworker to stop
77D	Leadership would ignore it

    If another coworker were to complain about this…

77E*	The complaint would be taken seriously
77F	It would be risky for the person making the complaint
77G*	Some corrective action would be taken
77H	Other coworkers would treat the person who made the complaint badly
77I	The complaint would be ignored

Suppose a supervisor at your duty station were to suggest that the way to get along and get good assignments is to be sexually cooperative to him/her.

    If a supervisor at your duty station were to do this…

78A	Others in the unit would not care
78B*	The supervisor would get in trouble with his or her supervisor
78C*	Others in the unit would tell the supervisor to stop
78D	Leadership would ignore it

    If a coworker were to complain about this…

78E*	The complaint would be taken seriously
78F	It would be risky for the person making the complaint
78G*	Some corrective action would be taken
78H	Other coworkers would treat the person who made the complaint badly
78I	The complaint would be ignored

*Reverse coded.

Scales in the Personnel Policy and Practices Section

Item 79, Leadership Efforts to Stop Sexual Harassment. In Items 79A-C, survey participants were asked to indicate whether leadership "made honest and reasonable efforts to stop sexual harassment" (see Table 25). Response options ranged from 1 *(yes)* to 2 *(no)* with an additional option "*don't know"* (coded 99). The "*don't know*" option was recoded as the middle option based on research indicating that a "*don't know*" option tends to act as a midpoint (Drasgow et al., 1999). A higher score indicates a higher perception of leadership as making "honest and reasonable efforts to stop sexual harassment."

Items 79A-C were originally utilized on *1995 Form B*. The Leadership Efforts to Stop Sexual Harassment scale is intended to assess perceptions of whether or not senior leadership and immediate supervisors make efforts to stop sexual harassment. Alpha coefficients were .82 for the total sample, .84 for men, and .80 for women (see Table 1). Recommendations for future surveys include expanding this scale to incorporate additional leadership practices because research finds an association between such practices and lower rates of unprofessional, gender-related behavior in a military context (Hunter Williams et al., 1999).

Table 25.
Scale Items Measuring Leadership's Efforts to Stop Sexual Harassment

---

Leadership Efforts to Stop Sexual Harassment

Please give your opinion about whether the persons below make honest and reasonable efforts to stop sexual harassment, regardless of what is said officially.

79A	Senior leadership of my Service
79B	Senior leadership of my installation/ship
79C	My immediate supervisor

Item 82, Training and Education. In Items 82A-G, survey participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with statements regarding training and education about sexual harassment (see Table 26). Response options ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree)* to 5 (*strongly agree)*. A higher score indicates that respondents endorse receiving training and education about sexual harassment.

This new item was pretested (Ormerod et al., 2001) for use in *2002 WGR*.[32] It replaces a similar construct that was assessed in *1995 Form B*. These seven items assess respondents'

---

[32] Items 82A-82G are slightly modified versions of items used in the *Status of the Armed Forces Survey Pilot Forms A* and *B-Gender Issues*. Modifications were made to item content. For example Item 82A was originally listed as "Has given me a better understanding of what words and actions are considered sexual harassment" in the pilot study.

perceptions about whether they have received adequate training and education about sexual harassment.

Reliability analysis for Items 82A-G resulted in an alpha of .94 for the total sample, an alpha for men of .95, and an alpha for women of .93 (see Table 1). There are no recommendations for modifications to the scale.

Table 26.
Scale Items Measuring Training and Education

Perceptions of Training and Education

82A	Provides a good understanding of what words and actions are considered sexual harassment
82B	Teaches that sexual harassment reduces the cohesion and effectiveness of your Service as a whole
82C	Teaches that sexual harassment makes it difficult for individual Service members to perform their duties
82D	Identifies behaviors that are offensive to others and should not be tolerated
82E	Gives useful tools for dealing with sexual harassment
82F	Makes you feel it is safe to complain about unwanted, sex-related attention
82G	Provides information about policies, procedures, and consequences of sexual harassment

Item 83, Training Required and Sexual Harassment Training Resources. In Items 83A-O, survey participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with statements regarding training and resources (e.g., policies, procedures, positive leadership behavior) related to sexual harassment within the unit/workgroup and on installation/ship (see Table 27). Response options ranged from 0 *(not at all)* to 4 *(very large extent)*. A higher score indicates a higher perception of required training and/or available resources relevant to sexual harassment.

The majority of these items were adapted from *1995 Form B*.[33] Items 83C, 83F, 83G, 83J, and 83N are new to *2002 WGR* survey.[34] The scales were originally conceived of as two parallel scales to assess respondents' perception of training requirements and availability of resources related to sexual harassment at the levels of the unit/workgroup and installation/ship (see Table 26). Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) did not support this rational grouping, therefore scales were formed on a rational/empirical basis resulting in a four-item scale measuring perceptions of whether training about sexual harassment is required (Items 83D, 83E, 83L, and 83M) and a nine-item scale tapping perceptions about whether policies, procedures, and

---

[33] Items 83A, 83B, 83D, 83E, 83H, 83I, 83K, 83L, 83M, and 83O are modified versions of items used in *1995 Form B*. Modifications were made to item content and scoring. For example, Item 83A was originally listed as "Establishing policies prohibiting sexual harassment" in *1995 Form B*. Additionally, scoring on *1995 Form B* utilized trichotomous response options of "*yes*", "*no*", and "*don't know*".

[34] Items 83C, 83F, 83J, and 83N were pilot tested in a sample of military personnel in the *Status of the Armed Forces Survey Pilot Forms A* and *B-Gender Issues* (Ormerod et al., 2001).

resources about sexual harassment (Items 83A-C, 83F, 83H-K, and 83N) are publicized and readily available.

Alpha coefficients for the total sample, women, and men for Training Required (Items 83D, 83E, 83L, and 83M) were .95 (see Table 1). Alpha coefficients for the total sample, women, and men for Sexual Harassment Training Resources (Items 83A-C, 83F, 83H-K, and 83N) were .93 (see Table 1). Items 83G and 83O were dropped following initial reliability analyses because they had particularly low item-total correlations.

A two-factor CFA model using maximum likelihood estimation was fit to the data based on organizational level (i.e., Items 83A-G, Unit/Workgroup and Items 83H-N, Ship/Installation). Looking across all of the fit indices, the model demonstrated unacceptably poor fit. For example, RMSEA = .27, NNFI = .80, SRMR = .09, GFI = .55, AGFI = .38, and CFI = .83 in the total sample (see Appendix A). A two-factor CFA model using maximum likelihood estimation was fit to the data based on the rational/empirical grouping of training and resources described above. A slightly better fit was obtained. For example, RMSEA = .22, NNFI = .87, SRMR = .07, GFI = .68, AGFI = .55, and CFI = .90 in the total sample (see Appendix A). Items 82 and 83 assess various aspects of training and resources and total 22 items together. Recommendations for future surveys include eliminating any items that overlap based on substantive reasons and additional item response theory analyses.

Table 27.
Scale Items Measuring Training Required and Sexual Harassment Training Resources

Sexual Harassment Training and Resources

IN YOUR UNIT/WORKGROUP

83A	Policies forbidding sexual harassment publicized?
83B	Complaint procedures related to sexual harassment publicized?
83C	Complaints about sexual harassment taken seriously no matter who files them?
83D	Enlisted members required to attend formal sexual harassment training?
83E	Officers required to attend formal sexual harassment training?
83F	Leaders consistently modeling respectful behavior to both female and male personnel?
83G	Male supervisors asking female officers or NCOs/petty officers from other workgroups to "deal with" problems involving female subordinates? †

ON YOUR INSTALLATION/SHIP

83H	Policies forbidding sexual harassment publicized?
83I	Complaint procedures related to sexual harassment publicized?
83J	Complaints about sexual harassment taken seriously no matter who files them?
83K	There a specific office with the authority to investigate sexual harassment complaints?
83L	Enlisted members required to attend formal sexual harassment training?
83M	Officers required to attend formal sexual harassment training?
83N	Leaders consistently modeling respectful behavior to both male and female personnel?

IN YOUR SERVICE

83O	An advice/hotline available for reporting sexual harassment complaints? †

†Omitted from final version of the Sexual Harassment Training and Resources scale.

Discussion

2002 WGR advances the assessment of unprofessional, gender-related behaviors and workplace relations in several important ways. Use of the DoD Sexual Harassment Core Measure provides a uniform approach to counting incidents that will enable direct comparisons of the rates of sexual harassment across DoD- and Service-wide studies. Inclusion of a wide array of correlate measures will increase understanding about workplace relations and the antecedents and consequences of unprofessional, gender-related behaviors.

This report provides details about scales constructed from *2002 WGR*. The scales in this report have psychometric support and a history of being useful with a military population. Of those scales formed via an iterative method of analyzing items for both content and statistical homogeneity, such composites have a strong justification. However, other researchers may find that variables defined in terms of different sets of items are preferable and there is no inherent problem in considering alternative multi-item composites; if the alternate composite is theoretically justified with adequate reliability.

In sum, *2002 WGR* produced an extraordinarily rich set of data for the study of workplace and gender relations. Reliable and valid measures of workplace variables, including unprofessional, gender-related behaviors, were collected from an ethnically diverse sample of members of all the Services comprising the DoD. This data set substantially furthers the scientific understanding of workplace relations and unprofessional, gender-related behavior and will enable policy makers to make more informed decisions about how to address such issues in the Armed Forces.

References

1999 Survey of Active Duty Personnel [Data file and documentation on CD-ROM]. (2001). Arlington, VA: DMDC.

Armed Forces Equal Opportunity Survey [Data file and documentation on CD-ROM]. Arlington, VA: DMDC.

Arvey, R. D., & Cavanaugh, M. A. (1995). Using surveys to assess the prevalence of sexual harassment: Some methodological problems. *Journal of Social Issues*, *51*, 117-138.

Bastian, L. D., Lancaster, A. R., & Reyst, H. E. (1996). *Department of Defense 1995 Sexual Harassment Survey* (Report No. 96-014). Arlington, VA: DMDC.

Bentler, P. M. (1995). *EQS structural equations program manual.* Encino, CA: Multivariate Software.

Byrne, B. M. (1998). *Structural equation modeling with LISREL, PRELIS, and SIMPLIS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cortina, L. M., & Magley, V. J. (in press). Raising voice, risking retaliation: Events following interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*.

Drasgow, F., Fitzgerald, L. F., Magley, V. J., Waldo, C. R., & Zickar, M. J. (1999). The *1995 Armed Forces Sexual Harassment Survey: Report on scales and measures* (Report No. 98-004). Arlington, VA: DMDC.

Edwards, J. E., Elig, T. W., Edwards D. L., & Riemer, R. A. (1997). *The 1995 Armed Forces Sexual Harassment Survey: Administration, datasets, and codebook for Form B* (Report No. 95-015). Arlington, VA: DMDC.

Elig, T. W. (2003). *Sample design for the Status of the Armed Forces Surveys—Workplace and Gender Relations.* In B. J. George & K. R. Kroeger (Eds.), *2002 Status of the Armed Forces Surveys—Workplace and Gender Relations: Statistical methodology report* (Report No. 2003-014). Arlington, VA: DMDC.

Fitzgerald, L. F. (1990, March). *Assessing strategies for coping with sexual harassment.* Paper presented at the midwinter conference of the Association for Women in Psychology, Tempe, AZ.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Drasgow, F., & Magley, V. J. (1999). Sexual harassment in the Armed Forces: A test of an integrated model. *Military Psychology*, *11*, 329-343.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Drasgow, F., Magley, V. J., Waldo, C. R. (1999). Measuring sexual harassment in the military: The Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ-DoD). *Military Psychology*, *11*, 243-263.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Gelfand, M. J., & Drasgow, F. (1995). Measuring sexual harassment: Theoretical and psychometric advances. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *17*, 425-445.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Magley, V. J., Drasgow, F., & Waldo, C. R. (1999). Measuring sexual harassment in the military: The Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ-DoD). *Military Psychology*, *3*, 243-264.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Shullman, S., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, Ormerod, A. J., & Weitzman, L. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *32*, 152-175.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Smolen, A. C., Harned, M., S., Collinsworth, L. L., Colbert, C. L. (In preparation). *Sexual harassment: Impact of reporting and retaliation.* University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Swan, S. & Magley, V. J. (1997). But was it really sexual harassment? Legal, Behavioral, and psychological definitions of the workplace victimization of women. In W. O'Donohue (Eds.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research, and treatment* (pp. 5-28). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Gelfand, M. J., Fitzgerald, L. F., & Drasgow, F. (1995). The structure of sexual harassment: A confirmatory factor analysis across cultures and settings. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *47*, 164-177.

George, B. J., & Kroeger, K. R. (Eds.). (2003). *2002 Status of the Armed Forces Surveys—Workplace and Gender Relations: Statistical methodology report* (Report No. 2003-014). Arlington, VA: DMDC.

Glomb, T. M. & Liao, H. (In press). Interpersonal aggression in work groups: Social influence, reciprocal, and individual effects. *Academy of Management Journal*.

Helba, C., Keys, C, Lee, K., Hintze, W., O'Brien, J., Wright, L. C., & Williams, K. H. (2001). *Overview of the 1999 Survey of Active Duty Personnel* (Report No. 2000-008). Arlington, VA: DMDC.

Hoyle, R. H. (1995). The structural equation modeling approach: Basic concepts and fundamental issues. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Structural equation modeling: Issues, concepts, and applications* (pp. 56-75). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1998). Fit indices in covariance structure modeling: Sensitivity to underparameterized model misspecification. *Psychological Methods*, *3*, 424-453.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *6*, 1-55.

Hu, L., Bentler, P. M., & Kano, Y. (1992). Can test statistics in covariance structure analysis be trusted? *Psychological Bulletin*, *112*, 351-362.

Hulin, C. L., Fitzgerald, L. F., & Drasgow, F. (1996). Organizational influences on sexual harassment. In M. Stockdale (Ed.), *Sexual harassment in the workplace, Vol. 5*, (pp. 127-150). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hunter Williams, J., Fitzgerald, L. F., & Drasgow, F. (1999). The effects of organizational practices on sexual harassment and individual outcomes in the military. *Military Psychology*, *11*, 303-328.

Jöreskog, K. G., & Sörbom, D. (1993). *LISREL 8: User's reference guide*. Chicago: Scientific Software International.

Keene, S. D., Halpin, S. M., & Spiegel, D. K. (1996). *The leader Azimuth check: A leader self development tool*. Alexandria, VA: US Army Research Institute for Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Klem, L. (2000). Structure equation modeling. In L. G. Grimm and P. R. Yarnold (Eds.), *Reading and understanding more multivariate statistics* (pp. 227-260). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Lancaster, A. (1999). Department of Defense sexual harassment research: Historical perspectives and new initiatives. *Military Psychology*, *11*, 219-231.

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, appraisal, and coping. New York: Springer.

Magley, V. J., Waldo, C. R., Drasgow, F., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1999). The impact of sexual harassment on military personnel: Is it the same for men and women. *Military Psychology*, *11*, 283-302.

Mathieu, J. E., Klimoski, R. J., Rouse, C. E., & Marsh, W. M. (1997). *Evaluation of ARI leader assessment measures* (Research Note 98-06). Alexandria, VA: US Army Research Institute for Behavioral and Social Sciences.

McDonald, R. P., & Marsh, H. W. (1990). Choosing a multivariate model: Noncentrality and goodness of fit. *Psychological Bulletin*, *107*, 247-255.

Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *14*, 224-247.

Ormerod, A. J., Lee, W. C., Fitzgerald, L. F., & Drasgow, F. (2001). *The 2000 Armed Forces Sexual Harassment Survey: Report of scales and measures of the Y2K Pilot Survey*. (Report No. 2001-004). Arlington, VA: DMDC.

Roznowski, M. (1989). Examination of the measurement properties of the Job Descriptive Index with experimental items. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *74*, 805-814.

SAS System V8.02 [Computer software]. (1996). Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc.

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks: CA: Sage.

SPSS for Windows 11.0.1 [Computer Software]. (2001). Chicago, IL: SPSS Inc.

Stark, S., Chernyshenko, O. S., Lancaster, A. R., Drasgow, F., Fitzgerald, L. F. (2002). Toward standardized measurement of sexual harassment: Shortening the SEQ-DoD using item response theory. *Military Psychology*, *14*, 49-72.

Stewart, S. R., Kilcullen, R., & Hopkins, J. E. (1994*). Strategic leader development inventory (SLDI)*. Alexandria, VA: US Army Research Institute for Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Survey Method for Counting Incidents of Sexual Harassment (April 28, 2002). Washington, DC: Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness.

Veit, C. T. & Ware, J. E. (1983). The structure of psychological distress and well-being in general populations. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *51*, 730-742.

Ware, J. E. & Sherbourne, C. D. (1992). The MOS 36-item short form health survey (SF-36): I. Conceptual framework and item selection. *Medical Care*, *30*, 473-483.

West, S. G., Finch, J. F., & Curran, P. J. (1995). Structural equation models with nonnormal variables: Problems and remedies. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Structural equation modeling: Issues, concepts, and applications* (pp. 56-75). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Willis, E. J., Mohamed, S. G., & Lipari, R. N. (2002). *2002 Status of the Armed Forces Survey—Workplace and Gender Relations: Administration, datasets, and codebook* (Report No. 2002-010). Arlington, VA: DMDC.

Wright, L. C., Williams, K., & Willis, E. J. (2000). *1999 Survey of Active Duty Personnel: Administration, datasets, and codebook* (Report No. 2000-005). Arlington, VA: DMDC.

Appendix A.
Explanation and Table of Fit Indices for Factor Analysis Models

EXPLANATION AND TABLE OF FIT INDICES
FOR FACTOR ANALYSIS MODELS

Issues That Affect the Use of Fit Indexes

McDonald and Marsh (1990) concluded their Psychological Bulletin paper with the statement "Although experience can suggest a recommendable cutoff point for use by those who fear the 'subjectivity' of judgment, such a cutoff point must itself remain inevitably subjective as only the saturated model is true" (p. 254). Their point is that any p x p population (i.e., with no sampling error) variance-covariance matrix with p(p+1)/2 unique elements will require a model with p(p+1)/2 parameters to be fit perfectly. A restricted model – one with fewer than p(p+1)/2 parameters – will not fit perfectly. Because restricted models will not fit perfectly, researchers are inevitably left with the subjective evaluation of how close of an approximation is close enough. Fit statistics quantify the degree of approximation in various ways and with various strengths and weaknesses; it is important to remember, however, that the interpretation of these statistics is subjective.

Although cut scores for fit statistics in structural equation modeling (SEM) have been offered often (e.g., Byrne, 1998, provides suggestions culled from the SEM literature), attention to some problematic aspects of their interpretation is increasing. For example, one well-known and much discussed problem is the influence of sample size on the chi-square statistic, one of the fundamental fit statistics in covariance structure analysis. Hu and Bentler (1998) and many others have shown that the chi-square is subject to systematic fit-index bias such that its expected value is a monotonically increasing function of sample size. Hence, models appear to fit better in smaller samples and a large chi-square will inevitably result when a large data set is analyzed. A variety of adjustments to the chi-square statistic have been made in an attempt to obtain fit indices less dependent on sample size.

However, while there has been progress on developing fit indices not dependent on sample size, there is a more intractable problem: non-normality of the observed data. Standard structural equation models assume that the manifest variables follow a multivariate normal distribution; obviously, responses to survey items do not always satisfy this assumption. Fit indexes based on the chi-square statistic derived from the multivariate normal assumption (e.g., RMSEA, CFI, NNFI, NFI, GFI, and AGFI) do not have a statistical justification when item responses are analyzed. These problems lead to the over-rejection of correct models (West, Finch, & Curran, 1995).

Specifically, commonly used estimation methods such as Maximum Likelihood (ML) and Generalized Least Squares (GLS) operate under certain assumptions that may or may not adequately describe real data. For example, both methods assume that variables in the dataset are normally distributed and are continuous. West, et al. (1995) indicate that these assumptions are very often violated when structural equation modeling is applied to real data. While researchers often ignore these assumption violations (if they examine their data to detect assumption violation at all), typically using asymptotic robustness theory as their justification, such a practice is dangerous. Hu, Bentler, and Kano (1992) stated bluntly "nothing is known about the robustness of the asymptotic robustness theory" (p. 352).

Does Assumption Violation Matter?

Research on the effects of assumption violation is limited. In one study, Hu and Bentler (1998) tested various fit statistics using different sample sizes of data that violated normal-theory assumptions. Specifically, their data violated the multivariate normal assumption by having excess kurtosis (i.e., highly "peaked" or highly "flat" distributions) and, for some of their samples, factors and errors that were dependent on each other. Based on their overall results, they concluded that the standardized root-mean-square residual (SRMR; Bentler, 1995) performed better than the other indexes they studied. Unfortunately, Hu and Bentler did not consider certain other normal-theory violations, such as discrete item responses that are highly skewed. In sum, the violations of assumptions examined in the available literature bear little resemblance to some of the violations encountered in real data such as those collected from *2002 WGR*.

Suggested Values for Fit Statistics

Hoyle (1995) stated that the minimum value of .90 for indexes, such as the non-normed fit index (NNFI; Tucker & Lewis, 1973) and Bentler's (1989; 1990) Comparative Fit Index (CFI), has been widely recognized as indicating good model fit. Byrne (1998), moreover, provided references of research recommending values near 1.00 for the goodness-of-fit index (GFI; Joreskog & Sorbom, 1984) and the adjusted Goodness-of-Fit index (AGFI; Joreskog & Sorbom, 1984), while Hu and Bentler (1998) cited the generally recommended value of .05 as the ceiling for good fit using the standardized root-mean-square residual (SRMR; Bentler, 1995) or the root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA; Steiger & Lind, 1980; Steiger, 1989). Finally, Hu and Bentler (1999) endorsed a two-index approach, in which a cutoff of .06 for SRMR would be used in conjunction with a cutoff of .95 for indexes like the NNFI and CFI or a cutoff of .05 for RMSEA.

Do Cutoffs Work?

Recommended cutoffs for fit indices are based on the ideal situation in which no assumptions are violated. Unfortunately, as noted above, ideal situations to use these cutoff values are not often found in practice. The implication of this is that test statistics provided by statistical packages (i.e., normal-theory test statistics) may be inadequate to assess the fit of a model and recommendations from the available literature are inadequate to determine the acceptability of a model. Moreover, when the number of response options of items vary as well as the degree of skew, as in data from *2002 WGR*, it is quite difficult to assign one cutoff value for all models. Those models for items with fewer response options and greater skew will display inferior chi-square values due to more severe violation of assumptions (i.e., the assumption of multivariate normal data). Hu and Bentler (1998) noted that "it is difficult to designate a specific cutoff value for each fit index because it does not work equally well with various types of fit indices, sample sizes, estimators, or distributions…" (p. 449).

To provide a concrete example of the problems encountered when applying ideal-situation cutoffs to real-world data, the Job Descriptive Index (JDI; Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969) is a widely used and well-validated (Roznowski, 1989) measure of job satisfaction. Although its subscales are widely recognized as essentially unidimensional, when a single-factor

CFA is fit to the raw data, the fit statistics range in the .80's—well below traditional SEM cutoff values (e.g., those described by Byrne, 1998). The most likely cause for this misfit is the discrete nature of the items, which use discrete response options (Yes, ?, No). However, when item parcels (i.e., sums of three or more items) are utilized in the analysis, the fit statistics improve dramatically. One of the solutions proposed by West, et al. (1995) for nonnormal variables is to use item parcels, specifically because these parcels tend to have distributions that more closely approximate the normal distribution assumed for SEM.

Byrne (1998) suggests taking a holistic approach to the examination of SEM models, examining fit statistics, but not neglecting other important features that indicate the acceptability of the model, such as the plausibility of parameter estimates and the size of standard errors. Given the current lack of knowledge about using SEM with discrete item response data, it is necessary to consider all aspects of model fit rather than to rely on fit statistics and particular cutoff scores alone. Often, a researcher must accumulate and rely on experience in SEM applications in order to determine what a "good" fit statistic is for a particular type of data.

Table 28.
Fit Indices for Factor Analysis Models

MODEL	Effective Sample	Adjusted Chi-Square[a]	DF	Adjusted Chi-Square/DF[b]	RMSEA	NNFI	SRMR	GFI	AGFI	CFI
Benefit Satisfaction (3 factor) Total Sample	5488	416.21	74	5.62	0.09	0.93	0.04	0.92	0.89	0.94
Men	3272	428.45	74	5.79	0.09	0.93	0.05	0.91	0.88	0.94
Women	2216	391.61	74	5.29	0.08	0.93	0.04	0.93	0.89	0.94
Passive and Active Exit Actions (2 factor) Total Sample	19913	83.96c	34	2.47c	0.05	0.99c	0.10	0.99c	0.99c	0.99c
Men	10129	76.91c	34	2.26c	0.05	0.99c	0.09	0.99c	0.99c	0.99c
Women	9655	94.53c	34	2.78c	0.06	0.98c	0.11	0.99c	0.98c	0.99c
Army Azimuth Scale (1 factor) Total Sample	18946	461.79	54	8.55	0.13	0.92	0.04	0.86	0.80	0.93
Men	9720	453.39	54	8.40	0.13	0.92	0.04	0.86	0.80	0.93
Women	9226	472.24	54	8.75	0.14	0.92	0.03	0.86	0.79	0.93
Army Azimuth Scale (2 factor) Total Sample	18946	385.46	53	7.27	0.12	0.93	0.03	0.88	0.83	0.95
Men	9720	383.80	53	7.24	0.12	0.93	0.03	0.88	0.83	0.94
Women	9226	389.54	53	7.35	0.12	0.93	0.03	0.88	0.83	0.95
Supervisor Satisfaction (1 factor, 99 coded 3 or Don't Know) Total Sample	19392	255.76	27	9.47	0.14	0.86	0.06	0.89	0.82	0.89
Men	9950	282.22	27	10.45	0.15	0.84	0.07	0.88	0.80	0.88
Women	9442	220.45	27	8.16	0.13	0.88	0.05	0.91	0.85	0.91
Coworker and Work Satisfaction (2 factor) Total Sample	20201	195.22	53	3.68	0.07	0.96	0.03	0.95	0.93	0.96
Men	10265	194.62	53	3.67	0.07	0.96	0.03	0.95	0.93	0.96
Women	9797	196.23	53	3.70	0.07	0.96	0.03	0.95	0.93	0.96

MODEL	Effective Sample	Adjusted Chi-Square[a]	DF	Adjusted Chi-Square/DF[b]	RMSEA	NNFI	SRMR	GFI	AGFI	CFI
Workplace Hostility (1 factor) Total Sample	19380	424.26	35	12.12	0.16	0.85	0.05	0.85	0.77	0.88
Men	9958	447.12	35	12.77	0.16	0.84	0.06	0.84	0.76	0.88
Women	9422	401.08	35	11.46	0.15	0.86	0.05	0.86	0.79	0.89
Workplace Hostility (aggregate items-1 factor) Total Sample	19380	63.59	5	12.72	0.15	0.94	0.03	0.95	0.86	0.97
Men	9958	78.71	5	15.74	0.17	0.93	0.03	0.94	0.83	0.96
Women	9422	49.06	5	9.81	0.13	0.96	0.02	0.97	0.90	0.98
Army Mentoring Item (1 factor) Total Sample	7124	1288.56	104	12.39	0.15	0.94	0.06	0.77	0.70	0.95
Men	3924	1204.36	104	11.58	0.15	0.94	0.06	0.78	0.72	0.95
Women	3200	1411.65	104	13.57	0.16	0.93	0.06	0.75	0.67	0.94
Army Mentoring Item (2 factors) Total Sample	7124	1156.22	103	11.23	0.14	0.95	0.06	0.79	0.72	0.96
Men	3924	1115.09	103	10.83	0.14	0.95	0.05	0.80	0.73	0.96
Women	3200	1205.08	103	11.70	0.15	0.95	0.06	0.78	0.71	0.95
Army Mentoring Item (3 factors) Total Sample	7787	336.12	51	6.59	0.11	0.97	0.04	0.91	0.87	0.97
Men	4249	338.85	51	6.64	0.11	0.97	0.04	0.91	0.86	0.97
Women	3538	337.10	51	6.61	0.11	0.97	0.04	0.91	0.86	0.97
Workplace Discrimination (1 Factor) Total Sample	19648	2295.33c	54	42.51c	0.06	0.98c	0.08	0.98c	0.98c	0.99c
Men	10095	1065.62c	54	19.73c	0.06	0.98c	0.08	0.98c	0.98c	0.99c
Women	9553	1008.4c	54	18.67c	0.06	0.98c	0.08	0.98c	0.98c	0.99c
Workplace Discrimination (3 Factor) Total Sample	19648	1371.47c	51	26.89c	0.04	0.99c	0.06	0.99c	0.99c	0.99c
Men	10095	636.66c	51	12.48c	0.03	0.99c	0.06	0.99c	0.99c	0.99c
Women	9553	812.43c	51	15.93c	0.04	0.99c	0.06	0.99c	0.99c	0.99c

Table 28. (Continued.)

MODEL	Effective Sample	Adjusted Chi-Square[a]	DF	Adjusted Chi-Square/DF[b]	RMSEA	NNFI	SRMR	GFI	AGFI	CFI
Gender Discrimination (1 Factor) Total Sample	19648	404.9c	54	7.50c	0.02	1.00c	0.07	1.00c	0.99c	1.00c
Men	10095	67.77c	54	1.26c	0.02	1.00c	0.07	1.00c	1.00c	1.00c
Women	9553	380.86c	54	7.05c	0.03	1.00c	0.08	0.99c	0.99c	1.00c
Gender Discrimination (3 Factor) Total Sample	19648	202.23c	51	3.97c	0.01	1.00c	0.04	1.00c	1.00c	1.00c
Men	10095	57.56c	51	1.13c	0.01	1.00c	0.04	1.00c	1.00c	1.00c
Women	9553	189.12c	51	3.71c	0.01	1.00c	0.05	1.00c	1.00c	1.00c
Unprofessional, Gender-Related Behaviors Scales (4 factors, no SA items, b crossloading) Total Sample	19604	1753.59c	98	17.89c	0.02	1.00c	0.04	1.00c	1.00c	1.00c
Men	10033	5054.24c	98	51.57c	0.02	1.00c	0.05	1.00c	1.00c	1.00c
Women	9571	1609.40c	98	16.42c	0.03	1.00c	0.04	1.00c	1.00c	1.00c
One Situation With the Greatest Effect (4 Factor) Total Sample	6820	2142.86c	98	21.87c	0.03	0.99c	0.06	0.99c	0.99c	0.99c
Men	1930	-9611.17c	98	-98.07c	0.06	1.00c	0.09	1.00c	1.00c	1.00c
Women	4890	2255.22c	98	23.01c	0.04	0.99c	0.07	0.99c	0.98c	0.99c
Subjective Distress (2 Factor) Total Sample	7103	70.32	8	8.79	0.13	0.93	0.05	0.96	0.89	0.96
Men	1985	60.53	8	7.57	0.12	0.94	0.05	0.96	0.90	0.97
Women	5118	68.05	8	8.51	0.12	0.93	0.05	0.96	0.89	0.96
Retaliation (1 factor) Total Sample	6864	1206.06c	44	27.41c	0.06	1.00c	0.05	1.00 c	0.99c	1.00c
Men	1910	949.32c	44	21.58c	0.04	1.00c	0.04	1.00c	1.00c	1.00c
Women	4954	1311.89c	44	29.82c	0.06	0.99c	0.06	1.00c	0.99c	1.00c

Table 28. (Continued.)

MODEL	Effective Sample	Adjusted Chi-Square[a]	DF	Adjusted Chi-Square/DF[b]	RMSEA	NNFI	SRMR	GFI	AGFI	CFI
Retaliation (2 factors) Total Sample	6864	582.77c	43	13.55c	0.04	1.00c	0.03	1.00c	1.00c	1.00c
Men	1910	593.11c	43	13.79c	0.03	1.00c	0.03	1.00c	1.00c	1.00c
Women	4954	613.76c	43	14.27c	0.04	1.00c	0.04	1.00c	1.00c	1.00c
Training Required and Sexual Harassment Training Resources (2 Factors) Total Sample	18062	1520.72	64	23.76	0.22	0.87	0.07	0.68	0.55	0.90
Men	10342	1532.37	64	23.94	0.22	0.88	0.07	0.68	0.54	0.90
Women	8836	1535.34	64	23.99	0.22	0.87	0.07	0.68	0.55	0.89
Training and Resources (2 Factors-by organizational level) Total Sample	18062	2419.47	76	31.84	0.27	0.80	0.09	0.55	0.38	0.83
Men	10342	2058.89	76	27.09	0.25	0.84	0.08	0.60	0.44	0.87
Women	8836	2454.83	76	32.30	0.28	0.79	0.09	0.55	0.37	0.82

Note. The Effective Sample is the n following listwise deletion for missing data. The N for the overall sample was 19,960, 9,725 for the women, and 10,235 for the men prior to listwise deletion.

Note. *df* = degrees of freedom; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; NNFI = non-normed fit index; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual; GFI = goodness-of-fit index; AGFI = adjusted goodness-of-fit index; CFI = comparative fit index.

[a]This is the adjusted chi-square. To improve interpretability, the observed chi-square was adjusted to that expected in a sample of N = 500.

[b]This is the adjusted chi-square to *df* ratio.

[c]Diagonally-weighted least squares estimation was used to estimate model parameters, and RMSEA and SRMR are the most appropriate indices to determine goodness of fit.

Appendix B.
Status of the Armed Forces Survey
Workplace and Gender Relations

STATUS OF THE ARMED FORCES SURVEYS

Workplace and Gender Relations (Form 2002GB)

COMPLETION INSTRUCTIONS

- **This is not a test, so take your time.**
- **Select answers you believe are most appropriate.**
- **Use a blue or black pen.**
- **Please PRINT where applicable.**
- **Place an "X" in the appropriate box or boxes.**

RIGHT	WRONG
☒	☑ ◯

- **To change an answer, completely black out the wrong answer and put an "X" in the correct box as shown below.**

CORRECT ANSWER	INCORRECT ANSWER
☒	■

- **Do not make any marks outside of the response and write-in boxes.**

MAILING INSTRUCTIONS

- **PLEASE RETURN YOUR COMPLETED SURVEY IN THE BUSINESS REPLY ENVELOPE. (If you misplaced the envelope, mail the survey to DMDC, c/o Data Recognition Corp., PO Box 5720, Minnetonka, MN 55343).**

- **IF YOU ARE RETURNING THE SURVEY FROM ANOTHER COUNTRY, BE SURE TO RETURN THE BUSINESS REPLY ENVELOPE ONLY THROUGH A U.S. GOVERNMENT MAIL ROOM OR POST OFFICE.**

- **FOREIGN POSTAL SYSTEMS WILL NOT DELIVER BUSINESS REPLY MAIL.**

PRIVACY NOTICE

In accordance with the Privacy Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-579), this statement informs you of the purpose of the survey and how the findings will be used. Please read it carefully.

AUTHORITY: 10 USC Sections 136 and 2358.

PRINCIPAL PURPOSE(S): Information collected in this survey will be used to report attitudes and perceptions of members of the Armed Forces about programs and policies. Information provided will assist in the formulation of policies to improve the working environment.

ROUTINE USE(S): None.

DISCLOSURE: Voluntary. However, maximum participation is encouraged so that data will be complete and representative. Ticket numbers and serial numbers on your survey are used to determine if you have responded and to use record data to properly analyze the survey data. Personal identifying information is not used in any reports. Only group statistics will be reported.

COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL

BACKGROUND

1. Are you . . . ?

- ☒ Male
- ☒ Female

2. What is the <u>highest</u> degree or level of school that you have completed? *Mark the <u>one</u> answer that describes the highest grade or degree that you have completed.*

- ☒ Less than 12 years of school (no diploma)
- ☒ GED or other high school equivalency certificate
- ☒ High school diploma
- ☒ Less than 2 years of college credits, but no college degree
- ☒ 2-year college degree (AA/AS)
- ☒ More than 2 years of college credits, but no 4-year college degree
- ☒ 4-year college degree (BA/BS)
- ☒ Some graduate school, but no graduate degree
- ☒ Master's, doctoral or professional school degree (MA/MS/PhD/MD/JD/DVM)

3. Are you Spanish/Hispanic/Latino? *Mark "No" if not Spanish/Hispanic/Latino.*

- ☒ No, not Spanish/Hispanic/Latino
- ☒ Yes, Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano
- ☒ Yes, Puerto Rican
- ☒ Yes, Cuban
- ☒ Yes, other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino

4. What is your race? *Mark one or more races to indicate what you consider yourself to be.*

- ☒ White
- ☒ Black or African American
- ☒ American Indian or Alaska Native
- ☒ Asian (e.g., Asian Indian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese)
- ☒ Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (e.g., Samoan, Guamanian or Chamorro)
- ☒ Some other race *(Please specify below.)*

Please print.

5. What is your marital status?

- ☒ Never married
- ☒ Married
- ☒ Separated
- ☒ Divorced
- ☒ Widowed

6. In what Service are you?

- ☒ Army
- ☒ Navy
- ☒ Marine Corps
- ☒ Air Force
- ☒ Coast Guard

7. What is your current paygrade? *Mark one.*

☒ E-1	☒ E-6	☒ W-1	☒ O-1/O1E
☒ E-2	☒ E-7	☒ W-2	☒ O-2/O2E
☒ E-3	☒ E-8	☒ W-3	☒ O-3/O3E
☒ E-4	☒ E-9	☒ W-4	☒ O-4
☒ E-5		☒ W-5	☒ O-5
			☒ O-6 or above

8. How many years of active-duty service have you COMPLETED (including enlisted, warrant officer, and commissioned officer time)? *To indicate less than one year, enter "00". To indicate thirty-five or more, enter "35".*

☐☐ *YEARS*

9. In which term of service are you serving now? *Do not count extensions as separate terms of enlistment.*

☒ You are on indefinite status ⇨ **IF INDEFINITE STATUS, GO TO QUESTION 11**
☒ You are an officer serving an obligation
☒ 1st enlistment
☒ 2nd or later enlistment

10. How likely is it that you would be allowed to stay on active duty at the end of your current term or service obligation?

☒ Very likely　　☒ Unlikely
☒ Likely　　☒ Very unlikely
☒ Neither likely nor unlikely

11. Assuming you could stay on active duty, how likely is it that you would choose to do so?

☒ Very likely　　☒ Unlikely
☒ Likely　　☒ Very unlikely
☒ Neither likely nor unlikely

12. If you could stay on active duty as long as you want, how likely is it that you would choose to serve in the military for at least 20 years?

☒ Does not apply, you already have 20 or more years of service
☒ Very likely
☒ Likely
☒ Neither likely nor unlikely
☒ Unlikely
☒ Very unlikely

13. When you leave active duty, how many total years of service do you expect to have completed? *To indicate less than one year, enter "00". To indicate thirty-five or more, enter "35".*

☐☐ *YEARS*

14. In general, has your <u>life</u> been better or worse than you expected when you first entered the military? ◆

☒ Much better　　☒ Somewhat worse
☒ Somewhat better　　☒ Much worse
☒ About what you expected　☒ Don't remember

15. In general, has your <u>work</u> been better or worse than you expected when you first entered the military?

☒ Much better　　☒ Somewhat worse
☒ Somewhat better　　☒ Much worse
☒ About what you expected　☒ Don't remember

16. Indicate the extent to which you are satisfied with each of the following.

	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Don't know or does not apply
a. Basic Pay	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	
b. Special and incentive pays including bonuses	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	
c. Basic Allowance for Subsistence (BAS)	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	
d. Basic Allowance for Housing (BAH)	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	
e. Retirement pay you would get	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	
f. Cost of living adjustments (COLA) to retirement pay	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	
g. Availability of medical care for yourself	☒	☒	☒	☒		
h. Availability of medical care for your family	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	
i. Quality of medical care for yourself	☒	☒	☒	☒		
j. Quality of medical care for your family	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	
k. Out of pocket costs for medical care		☒	☒	☒	☒	
l. Availability of childcare		☒	☒	☒	☒	
m. Quality of childcare		☒	☒	☒	☒	
n. Affordability of childcare		☒	☒	☒	☒	
o. Family support services		☒	☒	☒	☒	
p. Quality of your current residence	☒	☒	☒	☒		
q. Quality of your work environment (i.e., space, cleanliness, and maintenance and repair)		☒	☒	☒	☒	
r. Opportunities for civilian education		☒	☒	☒		
s. Opportunities for professional development		☒	☒	☒	☒	
t. Level of care and concern shown by supervisors for subordinates	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	
u. Quality of leadership	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	
v. Your career, in general	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	

17. Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about your Service.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
a. Being a member of your Service inspires you to do the best job you can	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
b. You are willing to make sacrifices to help your Service	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
c. You are glad that you are part of your Service	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
d. You are NOT willing to put yourself out to help your Service	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒

18. During the past 6 months, have you done any of the following to explore the possibility of leaving the military? *Mark "Yes" or "No" for each item.*

	Yes	No
a. Thought seriously about leaving the military	☒	☒
b. Wondered what life might be like as a civilian	☒	☒
c. Discussed leaving and/or civilian opportunities with family or friends	☒	☒
d. Talked about leaving with your immediate supervisor	☒	☒
e. Gathered information on education programs or colleges	☒	☒
f. Gathered information about civilian job options (for example, read newspaper ads, attended a job fair)	☒	☒
g. Attended a program that helps people prepare for civilian employment	☒	☒
h. Prepared a resume	☒	☒
i. Applied for a job	☒	☒
j. Interviewed for a job	☒	☒

19. If you had a friend considering active duty military service, would you recommend that he/she join? *Mark "Yes" or "No" for each item.*

a. A male friend
☒ Yes
☒ No

b. A female friend
☒ Yes
☒ No

20. Do you have children aged 10 or older with whom you talk about careers, jobs, and education?

☒ Yes ⇨ **IF YES, CONTINUE WITH QUESTION 21**
☒ No ⇨ **IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 23**

21. When you talk with your children about their future, do you encourage them to consider the military?

☒ Yes
☒ No

22. When you talk with your children about their possible career choices, how positive or negative are you about . . .

	Very positive	Positive	Neither positive nor negative	Negative	Very negative
a. The military, in general?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
b. Career opportunities in the military?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
c. Serving in the military, but not as a career?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
d. Part-time (National Guard/Reserve) opportunities in the military?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
e. Career opportunities as a civilian federal government employee?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
f. Career opportunities in the civilian sector?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
g. Seeking a college education?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒

23. During the last 12 months, where have you served most of your active-duty time?

☒ In one of the 50 states, DC, Puerto Rico, a U.S. Territory or possession

☐☐ *Please print the two-letter postal abbreviation - for example "AK" for Alaska*

☒ Europe (e.g., Bosnia-Herzegovina, Germany, Italy, Serbia, United Kingdom)
☒ Former Soviet Union (e.g., Russia, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan)
☒ East Asia and Pacific (e.g., Australia, Japan, Korea)
☒ North Africa, Near East, or South Asia (e.g., Bahrain, Diego Garcia, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia)
☒ Sub-Saharan Africa (e.g., Kenya, South Africa)
☒ Western Hemisphere (e.g., Cuba, Honduras, Peru)

24. During the last 12 months, where have you lived most of your active-duty time?

☒ Aboard ship
☒ Barracks/dorm (including BEQ or BOQ)
☒ Military family housing, on base
☒ Military family housing, off base
☒ Civilian housing you own or pay mortgage on
☒ Military or civilian housing you rent, <u>off base</u>
☒ Other

> **In this survey, the definition of "military duties" includes deployments, TDYs/TADs, training, military education, time at sea, and field exercises/alerts.**

25. In the past 12 months, have you been away from your permanent duty station/homeport overnight because of your military duties?

☒ Yes ⇨ **IF YES, CONTINUE WITH QUESTION 26**
☒ No ⇨ **IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 29**

26. During the past 12 months, how many separate times were you away from your permanent duty station/homeport for at least one night because of your military duties?

☒ 1 - 2 times   ☒ 9 - 10 times
☒ 3 - 4 times   ☒ 11 - 12 times
☒ 5 - 6 times   ☒ 13 - 24 times
☒ 7 - 8 times   ☒ 25 times or more

27. During the past 12 months, how long were you away from your permanent duty station/homeport for the following military duties? *Assign each of your nights away to only one type of military duty.*

	10 to 12 months	7 months to less than 10 months	5 months to less than 7 months	3 months to less than 5 months	1 month to less than 3 months	Less than 1 month	None
a. Operation Enduring Freedom	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
b. Peacekeeping or other contingency operation	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
c. Foreign humanitarian assistance mission	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
d. Unit training at combat training center	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
e. Counter drug operations	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
f. Domestic disaster or civil emergency	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
g. Time at sea for scheduled deployments (other than for the above)	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
h. Other time at sea (other than for the above)	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
i. Joint training/field exercises/alerts (other than for the above)	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
j. Military education (other than for the above)	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
k. Other TDYs/TADs	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒

28. In the past 12 months, what was the total length of time you were away from your permanent duty station/homeport because of your military duties? *Add up all nights away from your permanent duty station.*

☒ Less than 1 month
☒ 1 month to less than 3 months
☒ 3 months to less than 5 months
☒ 5 months to less than 7 months
☒ 7 months to less than 10 months
☒ 10 to 12 months

YOUR WORKPLACE

◆

- If you have been at your current duty location (ship) for one month or more, answer the questions on Workplace for your current duty location (ship), even if you are not permanently stationed at that location.
- Otherwise, answer the questions for the last duty location where you were located for at least a month.

29. How many months have you completed at your duty location/ship during your current tour? *To indicate ninety-nine or more, enter "99".*

☐☐ *MONTHS*

30. Is this location your permanent duty location/ship?

☒ Yes
☒ No, you are TDY/TAD attending training
☒ No, you are TDY/TAD for reasons other than training

31. Are you currently . . . *Mark "Yes" or "No" for each item.*

	Yes	No
a. A student in a military course?	☒	☒
b. Serving aboard a ship at sea?	☒	☒
c. In the shore part of a ship/shore rotation?	☒	☒
d. In a military occupational specialty (e.g., MOS/AFSC/Rating) not usually held by persons of your gender?	☒	☒
e. In a work environment where members of your gender are uncommon?	☒	☒
f. On a deployment that will keep you away from home for at least 30 consecutive days?	☒	☒

32. What is the gender of your immediate supervisor?

☒ Male
☒ Female

33. What is the paygrade of your immediate supervisor?

☒ E-4 or below   ☒ W-1   ☒ O-1/O1E
☒ E-5   ☒ W-2   ☒ O-2/O2E
☒ E-6   ☒ W-3   ☒ O-3/O3E
☒ E-7   ☒ W-4   ☒ O-4
☒ E-8   ☒ W-5   ☒ O-5
☒ E-9   ☒ O-6 or above

☒ Civilian GS-1 to GS-6 (or equivalent)
☒ Civilian GS-7 to GS-11 (or equivalent)
☒ Civilian GS-12 or above (or equivalent)

34. Which of the following statements best describes the gender mix of your current work group, that is, the people with whom you work on a day-to-day basis?

- ☒ All men
- ☒ Almost entirely men
- ☒ More men than women
- ☒ About equal numbers of men and women
- ☒ More women than men
- ☒ Almost entirely women
- ☒ All women

35. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your workplace?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
a. I know what is expected of me at work	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
b. I have the materials and equipment I need to do my work right	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
c. At work, I have the opportunity to do what I do best every day	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
d. In the last 7 days, I have received recognition or praise for doing good work	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
e. My supervisor, or someone at work, seems to care about me as a person	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
f. There is someone at work who encourages my development	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
g. At work, my opinions seem to count	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
h. The mission/purpose of my Service makes me feel my job is important	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
i. My coworkers are committed to doing quality work	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
j. I have a best friend at work	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
k. In the last 6 months, someone at work has talked to me about my progress	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
l. This last year, I have had opportunities at work to learn and to grow	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
m. At my workplace, a person's job opportunities and promotions are based only on work-related characteristics	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
n. My supervisor helps everyone in my work group feel included	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
o. I trust my supervisor to deal fairly with issues of equal treatment at my workplace	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
p. At my workplace, all employees are kept well informed about issues and decisions that affect them	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒

36. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Agree	Tend to agree	?	Tend to disagree	Disagree
a. My chain of command keeps me informed about important issues	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
b. If I make a request through channels in my work group, I know somebody will listen	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
c. My Service has established a climate where the truth can be taken up the chain of command without fear of reprisal	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
d. I find it very difficult to balance my work and personal responsibilities	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
e. Priorities or work objectives are changed so frequently, I have trouble getting my work done	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
f. My supervisor encourages people to learn from mistakes	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
g. My supervisor has sufficient authority	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
h. I believe my Service's core values are clear	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
i. Leadership generally understands the problems we face on our jobs	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒

37. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about your immediate supervisor? *The term "work group" refers to the people with whom you work on a day-to-day basis.*

	Don't know	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
a. **Handling the technical-skills part of the job** (fully understands the capabilities and limitations of equipment in the work group; demonstrates knowledge of tactical skills)	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
b. **Handling the people-skills part of the job** (demonstrates effective interpersonal skills, listens attentively, demonstrates concern for individuals)	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
c. **Handling the conceptual-skills part of the job** (thinks through decisions, recognizes and balances competing requirements, uses analytical techniques to solve problems)	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒

37. Continued

	Don't know	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree

d. **Communicating** (provides clear direction, explains ideas so that they are easily understood, listens well, keeps others informed, and writes well) . . . . ☒☒☒☒☒☒

e. **Decision making** (makes sound decisions in a timely manner, includes all relevant information in decisions and can generate innovative solutions to unique problems) . . . . ☒☒☒☒☒☒

f. **Motivating** (creates a supportive work environment, inspires people to do their best, acknowledges the good performance of others, and disciplines in a firm, fair, and consistent manner) . . . . ☒☒☒☒☒☒

g. **Developing** (encourages the professional growth of subordinates, is an effective teacher, uses counseling to provide feedback, provides the opportunity to learn, and delegates authority) . . . . ☒☒☒☒☒☒

h. **Building** (builds cohesive teams, gains the cooperation of all team members, encourages and participates in organizational and work group activities, focuses the work group on mission accomplishment) . . . . ☒☒☒☒☒☒

i. **Learning** (encourages open discussion that improves the organization, willingly accepts new challenges, helps the work group adapt to changing circumstances, recognizes personal limitations) . . ☒☒☒☒☒☒

j. **Planning and organizing** (develops effective plans to achieve organizational goals, anticipates how different plans will look when executed, sets clear priorities, willingly modifies plans when circumstances change) . . . . ☒☒☒☒☒☒

k. **Executing** (completes assigned missions to standard, monitors the execution of plans to identify problems, is capable of refining plans to exploit unforeseen opportunities) . . . . ☒☒☒☒☒☒

l. **Assessing** (accurately assesses the work group's strengths and weaknesses, conducts effective in-progress reviews and after-action reviews, takes time to find out what subordinate units are doing). ☒☒☒☒☒☒

38. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your work group?

	Don't know	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree

a. The leaders in your work group set high standards for Service members in terms of good behavior and discipline . . . . ☒☒☒☒☒☒

b. The leaders in your work group are more interested in looking good than being good . . . . ☒☒☒☒☒☒

c. You are impressed with the quality of leadership in your work group. . ☒☒☒☒☒☒

d. You would go for help with a personal problem to people in your chain of command . . . . ☒☒☒☒☒☒

e. The leaders in your work group are not concerned with the way Service members treat each other as long as the job gets done . . . . . ☒☒☒☒☒☒

f. The leaders in your work group are more interested in furthering their careers than in the well-being of their Service members . . ☒☒☒☒☒☒

g. Leaders in your work group treat Service members with respect . . . ☒☒☒☒☒☒

h. Leaders most often get willing and whole-hearted cooperation from the Service members in your work group . . . . ☒☒☒☒☒☒

i. The NCOs/petty officers in your chain of command are a good source of support for Service members . . . . ☒☒☒☒☒☒

39. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about . . .

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree

THE PEOPLE YOU WORK WITH

a. There is very little conflict among your coworkers. . . . . ☒☒☒☒☒

b. You like your coworkers . . . . ☒☒☒☒☒

c. Your coworkers put in the effort required for their jobs . . . . ☒☒☒☒☒

d. You are satisfied with the relationships you have with your coworkers . . . . ☒☒☒☒☒

e. The people in your work group tend to get along . . . . ☒☒☒☒☒

f. The people in your work group are willing to help each other . . . . ☒☒☒☒☒

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree

THE WORK YOU DO

g. Your work provides you with a sense of pride	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
h. Your work makes good use of your skills	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
i. Your present assignment is good for your military career	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
j. You like the kind of work you do	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
k. Your job gives you the chance to acquire valuable skills	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
l. You are satisfied with your job as a whole	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒

40. How often during the past 12 months have you been in workplace situations where military personnel, civilian employees, and/or contractor employees have targeted you with any of the following behaviors?

	Very often	Often	Sometimes	Once or twice	Never
a. Using an angry tone of voice	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
b. Avoiding you	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
c. Making you look bad	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
d. Yelling or raising one's voice	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
e. Withholding information from you . . .	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
f. Swearing directed at you	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
g. Talking about you behind your back .	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
h. Insulting, criticizing you (including sarcasm)	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
i. Saying offensive or crude things about you	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
j. Flaunting status or power over you .	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒

MENTORING

41. In your opinion, have you ever had a mentor while in the military?

☒ Yes, you have one now. ⇨ **IF YES, CONTINUE WITH QUESTION 42**

☒ Yes, you had one, but you don't have one now. ⇨ **IF YES, CONTINUE WITH QUESTION 42**

☒ No, but you would have liked one. ⇨ **IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 45**

☒ No, and you never wanted one. ⇨ **IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 45**

☒ No, you do not know what a mentor is. ⇨ **IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 45**

42. Who is your current mentor (or, if you have no current mentor, who was your most recent mentor)? *Mark one.*

☒ A commissioned officer
☒ A warrant officer
☒ An NCO/petty officer
☒ A junior enlisted Service member
☒ A DoD civilian
☒ Other *(Please specify below.)*

Please print.

43. Is your current mentor (or was your most recent mentor) . . . ? *Mark one.*

☒ Your rater
☒ Your senior rater
☒ A person who is/was higher in rank than you, but not your rater or your senior rater
☒ A person who is/was at your same rank
☒ A person who is/was lower in rank than you
☒ A person who is not or was not in the military at the time the mentoring was provided

44. If your current mentor (or if none now, your most recent mentor) provides the following assistance, how helpful is/was each to you? *Please mark one answer for each statement.*

	Extremely helpful	Very helpful	Moderately helpful	Slightly helpful	Not at all helpful	Not provided
a. Teaches job skills	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
b. Gives feedback on your job performance	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
c. Assigns challenging tasks	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
d. Helps develop your skills/ competencies for future assignments	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
e. Provides support and encouragement	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
f. Provides personal and social guidance	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
g. Provides career guidance	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
h. Demonstrates trust	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
i. Acts as a role model	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
j. Protects you	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
k. Invites you to observe activities at his/her level	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
l. Instills Service core values	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
m. Provides moral/ethical guidance . .	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
n. Teaches/advises on organizational politics	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
o. Provides sponsorship/contacts to advance your career	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
p. Assists in obtaining future assignments	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒

READINESS, HEALTH, AND WELL-BEING

45. Taking into account your <u>training</u> and <u>experience</u>, how well prepared are you to perform your wartime job?

- ☒ Very well prepared
- ☒ Well prepared
- ☒ Neither well nor poorly prepared
- ☒ Poorly prepared
- ☒ Very poorly prepared

46. How well prepared are you <u>physically</u> to perform your wartime job?

- ☒ Very well prepared
- ☒ Well prepared
- ☒ Neither well nor poorly prepared
- ☒ Poorly prepared
- ☒ Very poorly prepared

47. Not including injuries, how many days in the past 12 months have you been too sick to do your job?

- ☒ 0
- ☒ 1 - 5 days
- ☒ 6 - 10 days
- ☒ 11 - 15 days
- ☒ 16 - 20 days
- ☒ 21 or more days

48. How many days in the past 12 months have you been unable to do your job because of an injury suffered <u>at work</u>?

- ☒ 0
- ☒ 1 - 5 days
- ☒ 6 - 10 days
- ☒ 11 - 15 days
- ☒ 16 - 20 days
- ☒ 21 or more days

49. How many days in the past 12 months have you been unable to do your job because of an injury suffered <u>outside of work</u>?

- ☒ 0
- ☒ 1 - 5 days
- ☒ 6 - 10 days
- ☒ 11 - 15 days
- ☒ 16 - 20 days
- ☒ 21 or more days

50. How true or false is each of the following statements for you? *Please mark one answer for each statement.*

	Definitely true	Mostly true	Mostly false	Definitely false
a. I am as healthy as anybody I know	☒	☒	☒	☒
b. I seem to get sick a little easier than other people	☒	☒	☒	☒
c. I expect my health to get worse	☒	☒	☒	☒
d. My health is excellent	☒	☒	☒	☒

51. How much of the time during the past 4 weeks have you had any of the following problems with your work or other regular daily activities as a result of your <u>physical health</u>? *Please mark one answer for each statement.*

	All or most of the time	A good bit of the time	Some of the time	Little or none of the time
a. Cut down on the amount of time you spent on work or other activities	☒	☒	☒	☒
b. Accomplished less than you would like.	☒	☒	☒	☒
c. Were limited in the kind of work or other activities you do	☒	☒	☒	☒
d. Had difficulty performing the work or other activities you do (for example, it took extra effort)	☒	☒	☒	☒

52. How much of the time during the past 4 weeks have you had any of the following problems with your work or other regular daily activities as a result of <u>emotional problems</u> (such as feeling depressed or anxious)? *Please mark one answer for each statement.*

	All or most of the time	A good bit of the time	Some of the time	Little or none of the time
a. Cut down on the amount of time you spent on work or other activities	☒	☒	☒	☒
b. Accomplished less than you would like.	☒	☒	☒	☒
c. Didn't do work or other activities as carefully as usual	☒	☒	☒	☒

53. How much of the time during the past 4 weeks have you . . . *Please mark one answer for each statement.*

	All or most of the time	A good bit of the time	Some of the time	Little or none of the time
a. Felt calm and peaceful?	☒	☒	☒	☒
b. Been a very nervous person?	☒	☒	☒	☒
c. Felt so down in the dumps that nothing could cheer you up?	☒	☒	☒	☒
d. Felt downhearted and blue?	☒	☒	☒	☒
e. Been a happy person?	☒	☒	☒	☒

GENDER RELATED EXPERIENCES IN THE MILITARY IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS

54. During the past 12 months, did any of the following happen to you? If it did, do you believe your gender was a factor? *Mark only one answer for each statement.*

	Yes, and your gender was a factor	Yes, but your gender was NOT a factor	No, or does not apply
a. You were rated lower than you deserved on your last evaluation	☒	☒	☒
b. Your last evaluation contained unjustified negative comments	☒	☒	☒
c. You were held to a higher performance standard than others	☒	☒	☒
d. You did not get an award or decoration given to others in similar circumstances	☒	☒	☒
e. Your current assignment has not made use of your job skills	☒	☒	☒
f. Your current assignment is not good for your career if you continue in the military	☒	☒	☒
g. You did not receive day-to-day, short-term tasks that would have helped you prepare for advancement	☒	☒	☒
h. You did not have a professional relationship with someone who advised (mentored) you on career development or advancement	☒	☒	☒
i. You did not learn-until it was too late-of opportunities that would have helped your career	☒	☒	☒
j. You were unable to get straight answers about your promotion possibilities	☒	☒	☒
k. You were excluded from social events important to career development and being kept informed	☒	☒	☒
l. You did not get a job assignment that you wanted and for which you were qualified	☒	☒	☒

m. If you answered "Yes, and your gender was a factor" to "l" above, was this assignment legally open to women?

☒ No   ☒ Yes

n. Have you had any other adverse personnel actions in the past 12 months? (If "Yes," please specify below.)	☒	☒	☒

Please print.

55. In this question you are asked about sex/gender related talk and/or behavior that was unwanted, uninvited, and in which you did not participate willingly.

How often during the past 12 months have you been in situations involving

- ***Military Personnel***
  - **on- or off-duty**
  - **on- or off-installation or ship; and/or**
- ***Civilian Employees*** **and/or** ***Contractors***
  - **In your workplace or on your installation/ship**

where one or more of these individuals (of either gender) . . .

	Very often	Often	Sometimes	Once or twice	Never
a. Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
b. Referred to people of your gender in insulting or offensive terms?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
c. Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters (for example, attempted to discuss or comment on your sex life)?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
d. Treated you "differently" because of your gender (for example, mistreated, slighted, or ignored you)?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
e. Made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
f. Made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature that embarrassed or offended you?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
g. Made offensive sexist remarks (for example, suggesting that people of your gender are not suited for the kind of work you do)?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
h. Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
i. Put you down or was condescending to you because of your gender?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
j. Continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said "No"?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
k. Made you feel like you were being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behavior?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
l. Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative (for example, by mentioning an upcoming review)?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒

55. Continued

m. Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable? . . . . ☒☒☒☒☒

n. Made unwanted attempts to stroke, fondle, or kiss you? . . . . ☒☒☒☒☒

o. Treated you badly for refusing to have sex? . . . . ☒☒☒☒☒

p. Implied faster promotions or better treatment if you were sexually cooperative? . . . . ☒☒☒☒☒

q. Attempted to have sex with you without your consent or against your will, but was not successful? . . . ☒☒☒☒☒

r. Had sex with you without your consent or against your will? . . . . ☒☒☒☒☒

s. Other unwanted gender-related behavior? *(Unless you mark "Never," please describe below.)* . . . . ☒☒☒☒☒

Please print.

56. Do you consider ANY of the behaviors (a through s) which YOU MARKED AS HAPPENING TO YOU in Question 55 to have been sexual harassment?

☒ None were sexual harassment ⇨ **CONTINUE WITH QUESTION 57**

☒ Some were sexual harassment; some were not sexual harassment ⇨ **CONTINUE WITH QUESTION 57**

☒ All were sexual harassment ⇨ **CONTINUE WITH QUESTION 57**

☒ Does not apply–I marked "Never" to every item in Question 55 ⇨ **GO TO QUESTION 76**

One Situation with the Greatest Effect

57. Think about the situation(s) you experienced during the past 12 months that involved the behaviors you marked in Question 55. Now pick the SITUATION THAT HAD THE GREATEST EFFECT ON YOU.

---

57. Continued ◆

What did the person(s) do during this situation?
Mark one answer for each behavior.

a. Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you . . . . ☒☒

b. Referred to people of your gender in insulting or offensive terms . . . . ☒☒

c. Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters (for example, attempted to discuss or comment on your sex life) . . . . ☒☒

d. Treated you "differently" because of your gender (for example, mistreated, slighted, or ignored you) . . . . ☒☒

e. Made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities . . . . . . ☒☒

f. Made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature that embarrassed or offended you . . . . ☒☒

g. Made offensive sexist remarks (for example, suggesting that people of your gender are not suited for the kind of work you do) . . . . ☒☒

h. Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it . . . . ☒☒

i. Put you down or was condescending to you because of your gender . . . . ☒☒

j. Continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said "No". . . . . . ☒☒

k. Made you feel like you were being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behavior . . . . . ☒☒

l. Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative (for example, by mentioning an upcoming review) . . . . ☒☒

m. Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable . . . . ☒☒

n. Made unwanted attempts to stroke, fondle, or kiss you . . . . ☒☒

o. Treated you badly for refusing to have sex . . ☒☒

p. Implied faster promotions or better treatment if you were sexually cooperative . . ☒☒

q. Attempted to have sex with you without your consent or against your will, but was not successful . . . . ☒☒

r. Had sex with you without your consent or against your will . . . . ☒☒

s. Other unwanted gender-related behavior *(If you mark "Did this," please describe below.)* . ☒☒

Please print.

58. To what degree was this situation . . .

	Extremely	Very	Moderately	Slightly	Not at all
a. Annoying?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
b. Offensive?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
c. Disturbing?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
d. Threatening?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
e. Embarrassing?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
f. Frightening?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒

59. Where and when did this situation occur?

	All of it	Most of it	Some of it	None of it
a. At a military installation	☒	☒	☒	☒
b. At work (the place where you perform your military duties)	☒	☒	☒	☒
c. During duty hours	☒	☒	☒	☒
d. In the local community around an installation	☒	☒	☒	☒

60. What was the gender of the person(s) involved?

☒ Male
☒ Female
☒ Both males and females were involved
☒ Gender unknown

61. Was the person(s) involved . . . *Mark "Yes" or "No" for each.*

	Yes	No
a. Your immediate military supervisor?	☒	☒
b. Your immediate civilian supervisor?	☒	☒
c. Your unit commander?	☒	☒
d. Other military person(s) of higher rank/grade than you?	☒	☒
e. Other civilian employee(s) of higher rank/grade than you?	☒	☒
f. Your military coworker(s)?	☒	☒
g. Your civilian coworker(s)?	☒	☒
h. Your military subordinate(s)?	☒	☒
i. Your civilian subordinate(s)?	☒	☒
j. Your military training instructor?	☒	☒
k. Your civilian training instructor?	☒	☒
l. Other military person(s)?	☒	☒
m. Other civilian person(s)?	☒	☒
n. Other or unknown person(s)?	☒	☒

62. During the course of the situation you have in mind, how often did the event(s) occur?

☒ Once
☒ Occasionally
☒ Frequently
☒ Almost every day
☒ More than once a day

63. How long did this situation last, or if continuing, how long has it been going on?

☒ Less than 1 week
☒ 1 week to less than 1 month
☒ 1 month to less than 3 months
☒ 3 months to less than 6 months
☒ 6 months to less than 9 months
☒ 9 months to less than 12 months
☒ 12 months or more

64. Is the situation still going on?

☒ Yes
☒ No

65. To what extent did you . . .

	Very large extent	Large extent	Moderate extent	Small extent	Not at all
a. Try to avoid the person(s) who bothered you?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
b. Try to forget it?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
c. Tell the person(s) you didn't like what he or she was doing?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
d. Stay out of the person's or persons' way?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
e. Tell yourself it was not really important?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
f. Talk to some of your <u>family</u> about the situation?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
g. Talk to some of your <u>coworkers</u> about the situation?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
h. Talk to some of your <u>friends</u> about the situation?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
i. Talk to a <u>chaplain or counselor</u> about the situation?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
j. Try to avoid being alone with the person(s)?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
k. Tell the person(s) to stop?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
l. Just put up with it?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
m. Ask the person(s) to leave you alone?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
n. Blame yourself for what happened?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
o. Assume the person(s) meant well?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
p. Pray about it?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
q. Pretend not to notice, hoping the person(s) would leave you alone?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
r. Do something else in response to the situation?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒

66. Did you report this situation to any of the following installation/Service/DoD individuals or organizations? *Mark "Yes" or "No" for each.*

	Yes	No
a. Your immediate supervisor	☒	☒
b. Someone else in your chain-of-command (including your commanding officer)	☒	☒
c. Supervisor(s) of the person(s) who did it	☒	☒
d. Special military office responsible for handling these kinds of complaints (for example, Military Equal Opportunity or Civil Rights Office)	☒	☒
e. Other installation/Service/DoD person or office with responsibility for follow-up	☒	☒

67. Did you answer "Yes" to at least one item in Question 66?

☒ Yes ⇨ **IF YES, CONTINUE WITH QUESTION 68**
☒ No ⇨ **IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 74**

68. What actions were taken in response to your report? *Mark "Yes," "No," or "Don't know" for each.*

	Yes	No	Don't know
a. Person(s) who bothered you was/were talked to about the behavior	☒	☒	☒
b. Your complaint was/is being investigated	☒	☒	☒
c. You were encouraged to drop the complaint	☒	☒	☒
d. Your complaint was discounted or not taken seriously (for example, you were told that's just the way it is, not to overreact, etc.)	☒	☒	☒
e. No action was taken	☒	☒	☒

69. How satisfied are you with the following aspects of the reporting process?

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
a. Availability of information about how to file a complaint	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
b. Treatment by personnel handling your complaint	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
c. Amount of time it took/is taking to resolve your complaint	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
d. How well you are/were kept informed about the progress of your complaint	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
e. Degree to which your privacy is/was being protected	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒

70. Is the action still being processed?

☒ Yes ⇨ **IF YES, GO TO QUESTION 73**
☒ No ⇨ **IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 71**

71. What was the outcome of your complaint? *Mark "Yes," "No," or "Don't know" for each.*

	Yes	No	Don't know
a. They found your complaint to be true	☒	☒	☒
b. They found your complaint to be untrue	☒	☒	☒
c. They were unable to determine whether your complaint was true or not	☒	☒	☒
d. The outcome of your complaint was explained to you	☒	☒	☒
e. The situation was corrected	☒	☒	☒
f. Some action was taken against the person(s) who bothered you	☒	☒	☒
g. Nothing was done about the complaint	☒	☒	☒
h. Action was taken against you	☒	☒	☒

72. How satisfied were you with the outcome of your complaint?

☒ Very satisfied
☒ Satisfied
☒ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
☒ Dissatisfied
☒ Very dissatisfied

➤ *If you were dissatisfied/very dissatisfied with the outcome of your complaint, please specify why below.*

Please print.

73. Did you report <u>all</u> of the behaviors you marked in Question 57 to one of the installation/Service/DoD individuals or organizations listed in Question 66?

☒ Yes ⇨ **IF YES, GO TO QUESTION 75**
☒ No ⇨ **IF NO, CONTINUE WITH QUESTION 74**

74. What were your reasons for not reporting behaviors to any of the installation/Service/DoD individuals or organizations in Question 66? *Mark "Yes" or "No" for each.*

	Yes	No
a. Was not important enough to report	☒	☒
b. You did not know how to report	☒	☒
c. You felt uncomfortable making a report	☒	☒
d. You took care of the problem yourself	☒	☒
e. You talked to someone informally in your chain-of-command	☒	☒
f. You did not think anything would be done if you reported	☒	☒
g. You thought you would not be believed if you reported	☒	☒
h. You thought your coworkers would be angry if you reported	☒	☒
i. You wanted to fit in	☒	☒

                                                                    Yes   No

j. You thought reporting would take too much time and effort .... ☒ ☒

k. You thought you would be labeled a troublemaker if you reported .... ☒ ☒

l. A <u>peer</u> talked you out of making a formal complaint .... ☒ ☒

m. A <u>supervisor</u> talked you out of making a formal complaint .... ☒ ☒

n. You did not want to hurt the person's or persons' feelings, family, or career..... ☒ ☒

o. You thought your performance evaluation or chance for promotion would suffer if you reported .... ☒ ☒

p. You were afraid of retaliation from the <u>person(s) who did it</u> .... ☒ ☒

q. You were afraid of retaliation or reprisals from <u>friends/associates of the person(s) who did it</u> .... ☒ ☒

r. You were afraid of retaliation or reprisals from <u>your supervisors or chain-of-command</u> .... ☒ ☒

s. Some other reason .... ☒ ☒

75. Sometimes people may have problems at work after a situation like the one you experienced. Did any of the following things happen <u>as a result of the situation or how you responded to it</u>? Mark "Yes," "No," or "Don't know" for each.

	Yes	No	Don't know
a. You were ignored by others at work	☒	☒	☒
b. You were blamed for the situation	☒	☒	☒
c. People gossiped about you in an unkind or negative way	☒	☒	☒
d. You lost perks/privileges that you had before	☒	☒	☒
e. You were given less favorable job duties..	☒	☒	☒
f. You were denied an opportunity for training	☒	☒	☒
g. You were given an unfair performance evaluation	☒	☒	☒
h. You were unfairly disciplined	☒	☒	☒
i. You were denied a promotion	☒	☒	☒
j. You were transferred to a less desirable job	☒	☒	☒
k. You were unfairly demoted	☒	☒	☒
l. You were mistreated in some other way ..	☒	☒	☒

OTHER WORKPLACE EXPERIENCES

The following items describe situations that sometimes happen in the workplace. What do you think would happen at your duty station in situations like these?

76. Suppose that a coworker at your duty station were to talk a lot at work about sex, trying to get others to talk about it, too. *Mark if you "agree" or "disagree" with each of the following statements.*

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
If a coworker at your duty station were to do this . . .					
a. Others in the unit would not care ...	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
b. The coworker would get in trouble with his or her supervisor	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
c. Others in the unit would tell the coworker to stop	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
d. Leadership would ignore it	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
If another coworker were to complain about this . . .					
e. The complaint would be taken seriously	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
f. It would be risky for the person making the complaint	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
g. Some corrective action would be taken	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
h. Other coworkers would treat the person who made the complaint badly..............................	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
i. The complaint would be ignored	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒

77. Suppose that a coworker at your duty station were to keep asking others for dates even after they have made it clear that they were not interested. *Mark if you "agree" or "disagree" with each of the following statements.*

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
If a coworker at your duty station were to do this . . .					
a. Others in the unit would not care ...	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
b. The coworker would get in trouble with his or her supervisor	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
c. Others in the unit would tell the coworker to stop	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
d. Leadership would ignore it	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
If another coworker were to complain about this . . .					
e. The complaint would be taken seriously	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
f. It would be risky for the person making the complaint	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
g. Some corrective action would be taken	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
h. Other coworkers would treat the person who made the complaint badly..............................	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
i. The complaint would be ignored	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒

78. Suppose that a supervisor at your duty station were to suggest that the way to get along and get good assignments is to be sexually cooperative to him/her. *Mark if you "agree" or "disagree" with each of the following statements.*

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
If a supervisor at your duty station were to do this . . .					
a. Others in the unit would not care . . .	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
b. The supervisor would get in trouble with his or her supervisor	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
c. Others in the unit would tell the supervisor to stop	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
d. Leadership would ignore it	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
If a coworker were to complain about this . . .					
e. The complaint would be taken seriously	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
f. It would be risky for the person making the complaint	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
g. Some corrective action would be taken	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
h. Other coworkers would treat the person who made the complaint badly	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
i. The complaint would be ignored	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒

PERSONNEL POLICY AND PRACTICES

79. Please give your opinion about whether the persons below make honest and reasonable efforts to stop sexual harassment, regardless of what is said officially. *Mark "Yes," "No," or "Don't know" for each.*

	Yes	No	Don't know
a. Senior leadership of my Service	☒	☒	☒
b. Senior leadership of my installation/ship . .	☒	☒	☒
c. My immediate supervisor	☒	☒	☒

80. Have you had any training during the *past 12 months* on topics related to sexual harassment?

☒ Yes ⇨ **IF YES, CONTINUE WITH QUESTION 81**
☒ No ⇨ **IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 83**

81. In the past 12 months, how many times have you had training on topics related to sexual harassment? *To indicate nine or more, enter "9".*

☐ *TIMES*

82. My Service's training . . . *Mark if you "agree" or "disagree" with each of the following statements.* ◆

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
a. Provides a good understanding of what words and actions are considered sexual harassment	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
b. Teaches that sexual harassment reduces the cohesion and effectiveness of your <u>Service</u> as a whole	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
c. Teaches that sexual harassment makes it difficult for individual <u>Service members</u> to perform their duties	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
d. Identifies behaviors that are offensive to others and should not be tolerated	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
e. Gives useful tools for dealing with sexual harassment	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
f. Makes you feel it is safe to complain about unwanted, sex-related attention	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
g. Provides information about policies, procedures, and consequences of sexual harassment	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒

83. To what extent is/are . . .

	Very large extent	Large extent	Moderate extent	Small extent	Not at all
IN YOUR UNIT/WORK GROUP					
a. Policies forbidding sexual harassment publicized?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
b. Complaint procedures related to sexual harassment publicized?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
c. Complaints about sexual harassment taken seriously no matter who files them?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
d. Enlisted members required to attend formal sexual harassment training? .	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
e. Officers required to attend formal sexual harassment training?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
f. Leaders consistently modeling respectful behavior to both male and female personnel?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
g. Male supervisors asking female officers or NCOs/petty officers from other work groups to "deal with" problems involving female subordinates?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒

	Very large extent	Large extent	Moderate extent	Small extent	Not at all
ON YOUR INSTALLATION/SHIP					
h. Policies forbidding sexual harassment publicized?............	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
i. Complaint procedures related to sexual harassment publicized?.....	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
j. Complaints about sexual harassment taken seriously no matter who files them?............	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
k. There a specific office with the authority to investigate sexual harassment complaints?...........	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
l. Enlisted members required to attend formal sexual harassment training?..	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
m. Officers required to attend formal sexual harassment training?........	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
n. Leaders consistently modeling respectful behavior to both male and female personnel?	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
IN YOUR SERVICE					
o. An advice/hotline available for reporting sexual harassment complaints?......................	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒

84. Do you think sexual harassment is more of a problem inside the military or more of a problem outside the military?

☒ More of a problem <u>inside</u> the military
☒ More of a problem <u>outside</u> the military
☒ Same/no difference

85. In your opinion, has sexual harassment in our <u>nation</u> become more or less of a problem over the last 4 years?

☒ Less of a problem today
☒ About the same as 4 years ago
☒ More of a problem today

86. In your opinion, has sexual harassment in the <u>military</u> become more or less of a problem over the last 4 years?

☒ Don't know, you have been in the military less than 4 years
☒ Less of a problem today
☒ About the same as 4 years ago
☒ More of a problem today

87. In your opinion, how often does sexual harassment occur in the military now, as compared with a few years ago?

☒ Don't know, you have been in the military less than 4 years
☒ Much less often
☒ Less often
☒ About the same
☒ More often
☒ Much more often

88. Would you like to know the results of this survey? *If you are interested in being notified when a brief summary of the results is available on the Web, please print your e-mail address below. This e-mail address will be used for no other purpose than this notification.*

Please print

89. On what date did you complete this survey? | Y | Y | Y | Y | M | M | D | D |

COMMENTS

90. If you have comments or concerns that you were not able to express in answering this survey, please print them in the space provided. Any comments you make on this questionnaire will be kept confidential, and no follow-up action will be taken in response to any specifics reported. If you want to report a harassment problem, information about how to do so is available through your command Equal Opportunity or Civil Rights Office.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND ASSISTANCE

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1. REPORT DATE *(DD-MM-YYYY)*	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED *(From - To)*

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE

5a. CONTRACT NUMBER

5b. GRANT NUMBER

5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER

6. AUTHOR(S)

5d. PROJECT NUMBER

5e. TASK NUMBER

5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)

10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)

11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

14. ABSTRACT

15. SUBJECT TERMS

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			
					19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER *(Include area code)*